

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Oxford Philological Society

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A.

K. J. MAIDMENT, M.A.

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society

Representing the Council of the
Classical Association

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LXII

MAY 1948

Number 1

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS

ATHENIAN FOOD SUPPLIES FROM EUBOEIA. H. D. WESTLAKE

THE EION EPIGRAM. A. W. GOMME

THE GREEK FOR 'MINIMUM'. J. TATE

AN EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENT FROM TANAGRA. W. M. CALDER

HORACE, *Odes* i. 28. 7-8. (1) J. G. GRIFFITHS

(2) A. Y. CAMPBELL

THE AXES AGAIN. H. W. STUBBS

TERENCE *Heaut.* 46. D. A. KIDD

HORACE, *Odes* iv. 7. 13. D. A. KIDD

PROPERTIUS, iv. 2. 37. W. R. SMYTH

STATIUS, *Silvae* i. 2. 183. W. R. SMYTH

REVIEWS:

Folk-Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics (Carpenter), H. L. LORIMER 14; *Religions-historische Studien über Herodotus* (Daniels), H. J. ROSE 17; *Essai sur le Tragique d'Euripide* (Rivier), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM 17; *Épique et ses Dieux* (Festugière), C. BAILEY 20; *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien* (Erbe), H. J. ROSE 21; *Storia della letteratura latina* (Bignone), i, O. SEUTSCH 22; ii, C. BAILEY 23; *Stace, Silves* (Frère), W. R. SMYTH 25; *Ternullianus De Pallio* (Gerlo), A. SOUTER 26; *Die Judenpredigt Augustins* (Blumenkranz), C. JENKINS 27; *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts*, x (Lake), E. H. MINNS 28; *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism* (Harrick), A. M. CLARK 30; *Cicero's Fight for the Republic* (Frisch), A. F. GILES 31; *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire* (Hyde), C. JENKINS 33; *The Religious Policy of the Roman Emperors* (Müller), N. H. BAYNES 34; *The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians* (Brownie), G. R. C. DAVIS 35; *Baschiastexte und andere Papyri der Lunder Papyrussammlung* (Knutsson), C. H. ROBERTS 36; *Antike Kunst in der Schweiz* (Blonach), A. J. B. WACE 37; *Attic Red-figured Vases* (Richter), T. B. L. WHEELER 38; *La Survivance des Dieux Antiques* (Sennec), T. S. R. BOASE 39; *The Elements of Roman Law* (Lee), A. H. CAMPBELL 40.

SHORT REVIEWS

CORRESPONDENCE

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

BOOKS RECEIVED

41

44

44

47

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 5s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$6.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 6s., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

maintain
pinion
cation;
and call
lovers

annual
annual
York in
ew and
bscrip-
ription
for an

r. J. S.
ther of
Road,
e Hon.
arming-
ondon,
Oxford,
on and



I
V
h
b
P
h
C
P
n
n
f
n
h
e
s
o
h
n
A

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

MAY 1948

NOTES AND NEWS

IN *The Humanities in Canada* Professors Watson Kirkconnell and A. S. P. Woodhouse have produced a very detailed but highly readable survey of the present position of humane studies (languages, literature, history, and philosophy) in Canadian education and of their prospects. In the schools the classics are not flourishing: despite the attacks of modern educationalists Latin has a fairly strong position, fortified by the requirements of the medical profession, but Greek has virtually disappeared except in the *collèges classiques*, which still rigidly maintain the old French classical tradition. All but three of the English-speaking universities provide honours courses in Classics, though in most of them these do not conform to the British pattern. Advanced studies are severely handicapped by isolation, by the absence of learned societies and journals, by inadequate libraries and by low salaries; the record of scholarly work which is printed in an appendix is the more impressive in view of the difficulties under which much of it was pursued. The authors have some excellent introductory remarks on the purpose of the humanities in education, and conclude by suggesting reforms which they think are necessary if Canada is to rank 'as a civilized nation and not merely as an enormously wealthy and heavily industrialized Siberian hinterland to the civilized world'. We are vastly more fortunate, but much of what is said here might well be taken to heart in this country.

In *C.R.* lxi. 1 reference was made to the growing interest in classical studies in Turkey. We learn from a correspondent that, thanks to Egyptian enterprise, the same road is being made easy for the Arabic-speaking student. Mr. Amir Salama, Librarian of the Fouad I University at Giza, has already pub-

lished in Arabic a Greek grammar and (with a colleague) a Latin Grammar and has in the press a Greek-Arabic lexicon, a dictionary of classical mythology, and a work on Hesiod with an Arabic translation.

Last summer the University of Bordeaux celebrated its five hundredth birthday, and the editors of the *Revue des Études Anciennes*, which is now published under the joint auspices of the six universities of the Sud-Ouest and the Midi, have happily marked the occasion by producing a *fascicule bordelais*, all the contributors to which are present or former teachers at Bordeaux. P. Boyancé writes on Lucretius and Poetry, J. Moreau on Plato and Christian Idealism, M. Lejeune on Prehellenic Language, J. Audiat on the Homeric formula μέγ' ὀρθήσας, R. Vallois on the altar in the *Peace*, J. Coupry on the under-secretary of the Athenian Amphictyony at Delos, F. Thomas on the Latin subjunctive of repeated action: other articles are concerned with Gallo-Roman archaeology. Prefixed is a short account of the seventy-year history of the *Revue* itself, of its origins in Bordeaux, and of the great names which have been associated with it since the early days of Couat and Collignon. We take the opportunity of wishing it a future as distinguished as its past.

We welcome Portugal's new classical journal, *Humanitas*. It appears under the auspices of the recently established Institute of Classical Studies of the University of Coimbra, which is concerned, in this way and in others, to revive and strengthen the long humanistic tradition of Portugal. Portuguese scholars have engaged the co-operation in their enterprise of their neighbours of Spain and of other foreign scholars. For the present, one number a year is

contemplated; that for 1947 has now been published. The editor, Professor Rebelo Gonçalves, introduces it with a history of classical studies at Coimbra. A. Tovar writes on Latin genitives in -ius, F. Martins on the supernatural in Latin epic, J. G. Branco on the pronunciation of ecclesiastical Latin, A. de Carvalho on the humanist Clément Marot. Besides notes on the word *esox* and on a Coimbra inscription by J. M. Piel and on the ancient plough by R. Mayer, there are accounts of classical studies in Portugal, Rumania, and France and reviews of books.

In the last number of *C.R.* (lxi. 126) reference was made to Greek studies in Argentina. Another indication of the interest in classical studies in that country has now reached us. The University of Cuyo, with remarkable enterprise, is publishing its own *Revista de Estudios Clásicos*. Volume II, for 1946, is a beautifully printed volume of more than three hundred pages containing articles by teachers, graduates, and advanced students of the University (fourteen were pursuing advanced courses in 1945), supplemented by some translations into Spanish of articles which have appeared in American journals. The longest of the original articles deal with the Virgilian sources of *Waltharius*, the Greek spirit in Keats, the women of the *Iliad*, and the use of diminutives in Catullus.

The *Classical Journal*, of which the first number appeared in October, is the

organ of the Malta Branch of the Virgil Society, founded two years ago. The activity of the Branch says much for the enthusiasm of its members; in two years, besides producing the *Orestes* and the *Captivi*, it has heard a score of papers covering a wide range of classical subjects, and six of these are printed in its *Journal*. They deal with Ancient Malta, Catullus, the Maltese humanist Giuseppe Zammit, the Renaissance in Italy, France, and Spain, and the Spiritual Values of Western Civilization.

The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara has recently started work. Its aims are to organize and encourage research into all aspects of the archaeology of Turkey in all periods. The Institute has been established with the approval of the British Government, and the Turkish Government too has authorized its foundation, in a Cabinet Decree of 29 December 1947. The first Director is Professor J. Garstang, D.Sc., F.S.A., and the Committee, which meets in London, includes representatives of the British Museum, the British Academy, and British universities and archaeological bodies. It is hoped, if funds permit, to offer a Fellowship and a Scholarship each year and to arrange occasional publications. Inquiries should be addressed to the Joint Hon. Secretary, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, c/o the Institute of Archaeology, Inner Circle, Regent's Park, London, N.W. 1.

ATHENIAN FOOD SUPPLIES FROM EUBOEAE

Thucydides vii. 28. 1: ἡ τε τῶν ἐπιτηδείων παρακομὴ ἐκ τῆς Εὐβοίας, πρότερον ἐκ τοῦ Ὀρωποῦ κατὰ γῆν διὰ τῆς Δεκελείας θάσσωσιν οὐσα, περὶ Σούνιον κατὰ θάλασσαν πολυτελής ἐγένετο· τῶν τε πάντων ὁμοίως ἐπακτῶν εἰδείτο ἡ πόλις, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ πόλις εἶναι φρούριον κατέστη.

THIS passage is a startling one only if misinterpreted. With characteristic economy of words Thucydides packs into the first part of the sentence two separate points, both relating to the supply route from Euboea to Attica but otherwise unconnected: first, Euboean produce could reach Athens more rapidly

by the Oropus-Decelea route (hereafter called the overland route), which was now closed, than by the sea passage round Sunium (hereafter called the sea route); secondly, the cost of importing food by the sea route now became heavy. In making his second point he does not say, and surely does not mean, as some scholars appear to have assumed,¹ that

¹ e.g. Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, i. 70, 'cette route, dit Thucydide, est moins rapide et bien plus coûteuse'; Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* iii. 2. 1401; Ehrenberg, *People of Aristophanes*, 88, 'the occu-

to import by the sea route *the same amount* as had hitherto been imported by the overland route was more expensive. In the fifth century, as in other periods, transport by sea was normally far cheaper than transport by land, which, being largely by pack-animal in the absence of good roads, was most uneconomical and inefficient.¹ In his previous chapter Thucydides has explained that the permanent occupation of Decelea caused much more serious loss of production in Attica than had the relatively brief invasions during the Archidamian War (27. 3-5; cf. *Hell. Ox.* 12. 5 and Hardy, *C.P.* xxi (1926), 346-55). That this additional loss had to be made good by increasing the volume of imports is shown by his next point in the above passage (τῶν τε πάντων ὁμοίως ἐπακτῶν ἐδείτο ἡ πόλις),² and Euboea consequently became more precious as a source of supply than ever before (viii. 95. 2, *Εὐβοία γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκλημένης τῆς Ἀττικῆς πάντα ἦν*; 96. 2, *Εὐβοίαν ἀπωλωλέεσαν, ἐξ ἧς πλείω ἢ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὠφελοῦντο*; Arist. *Ἀθ. πολ.* 33. 1).³ What

became expensive was not a new scale of transport costs but the whole operation of compensating for the loss of Attic production by drawing to a greater extent upon the Euboean market. Though compression has led Thucydides to make παρακομιδή the subject of the sentence, he clearly has in mind not only the additional cost of transporting an increased tonnage, but also the additional cost of the imports themselves, which must have been a much heavier item of expenditure.

It is true that in this instance there were exceptional disadvantages in transport by sea and exceptional advantages in transport by land. The sea route was vulnerable, and when the Sicilian disaster cost the Athenians their undisputed command of the sea, their action in fortifying Sunium, where a naval station was probably established,⁴ was dictated by anxiety for their corn ships (viii. 4), including those from Euboea. Their enforced adoption of the sea route must also have necessitated the use of sea-going merchantmen capable of withstanding rough weather when rounding Sunium, and at this time they cannot have had many lying idle. In 413-412 they were making a sustained effort to restore their depleted war fleet,⁵ and the construction of merchant ships must have been almost entirely suspended. Hence, in order to obtain an adequate and rapid flow of supplies, they can scarcely have avoided the temporary diversion of shipping from longer routes, especially those from Pontus and Egypt,

pation of Deceleia made necessary the détournement of Attica by sea, and thus—surprisingly enough—increased the costs of transport’.

¹ Glotz, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 291-2, 295-6. Jardé, *Les Céréales dans l'Antiquité grecque*, i. 196, reaches the remarkable conclusion that a convoy of 340 mules or 990 asses would be required to transport a single day's supply of grain for the urban population. But Thucydides does not say that supplies from Euboea had been imported exclusively by the overland route before the occupation of Decelea, nor is there any reason to believe that the urban population was ever forced to rely exclusively on Euboea for its grain.

² Steup, n. ad loc., believes this phrase to be an independent addition to the catalogue of hardships imposed by the occupation of Decelea (though strangely he does not alter the colon after ἐγίνετο to a full-stop), but it surely refers to the preceding words.

³ The view that Euboea was merely a transit point on the Pontic corn route (Grundy, *Thucydides*, 79) is incompatible with the evidence of Thucydides (cf. Aristoph. *Wasps* 715-18). According to Michell, *Economics of Ancient Greece*, 261-2, it was only during the Peloponnesian War that ships from Pontus passed through the Euboean channel and were unloaded at Oropus, the alleged diversion being ‘a war-time measure due to fear of enemy privateers’. It is, however, difficult to believe that these ships were safer sailing for many miles within sight of a hostile shore than by way of Aegean islands dominated by the Athenians (cf.

Thuc. ii. 67. 4 on the dangers to which Athenian merchant shipping was exposed when coasting off the Peloponnese).

⁴ According to Kenny, *B.S.A.* xlii (1947), 194-200, the slip-sheds of which some remains have been found on the promontory belong to Hellenistic times. They may, however, have superseded an earlier and less elaborate construction; it is difficult to see how the fortification of Sunium could have afforded protection to corn ships (Σοῖνον τευχίσαντες, ὅπως αὐτοῖς ἀσφάλεια ταῖς σιταγωγαῖς ναυσὶν εἴη τοῦ περίπλου) unless warships were stationed there.

⁵ viii. 1. 3; 4. The substantial fleets sent to Asia towards the end of 412 (viii. 25. 1; 30. 1) must have been newly built (Busolt, *op. cit.* iii. 2. 1401, n. 1), much of the timber being probably procured from Macedonia (Westlake, *J.H.S.* lviii (1938), 37).

to the nearer, and doubtless dearer, market in Euboea. The overland route, on the other hand, apart from its advantage in speed to which Thucydides refers, had made no demands on sea-going merchant shipping. Euboean produce, as it became available, was no doubt ferried across in small boats to Oropus and thence carried by pack-animals, with almost no risk of interception, by the mountain road over a shoulder of Parnes through Declea to Athens.¹ It could there be delivered direct into the hands of Athenian merchants, whereas the bulk of foodstuffs imported by sea had to be moved by these merchants from the wharves of the Peiraeus to the upper city (cf. Arist. *Ἀθ. πολ.* 51. 4, and the abnormal and arbitrary measures of the Four Hundred recorded by Thuc. viii. 90. 5). These considerations, however, while they suggest why the Athenians chose to rely principally on the overland route until it was cut by the occupation of Declea, do not provide any grounds for believing that its transport costs were lower than, or indeed as low as, those of the sea route.² It may also be doubted whether the overland route could have handled the heavier traffic

necessitated by the serious shrinkage of home production in Attica.

These increased demands cannot have pleased the Euboeans. The cultivable parts of the island are very fertile, but they amount to only about one-fifth of its area, the remainder being mountainous country fit only for pasturing sheep. Evidence of traffic in foodstuffs from Euboea to Attica is negligible except during the Peloponnesian War (Michell, loc. cit.), when the devastation of their own country caused the Athenians to set great store by it (Aristoph. *Wasps* 715-18), as is shown by their measures to protect the west coast against piratical raids (Thuc. ii. 26. 1 and 32; iii. 17. 2).³ Euboea remained one of the few districts immune from military operations, and production must have been stimulated by the evacuation of livestock from Attica (ii. 14. 1). It was, however, in the period between the occupation of Declea and the revolt of 411 that the island was most valuable to Athens, and the insistence of Thucydides upon its importance at this time is very striking (viii. 95. 2 and 96. 2 quoted above; cf. viii. 1. 3 and 74. 2). So long as Athenian requirements remained moderate, the traffic in foodstuffs may have been welcome to Euboean farmers and merchants. When, however, the occupation of Declea greatly increased Athenian demands, which could not be refused by a subject ally, severe hardship was probably caused to the Euboeans, and this factor may have contributed to their disloyalty. They were the first among Athenian allies to make overtures to Agis (viii. 5. 1-2), and when after some intrigues and disappointments (60. 1-2) they had prevailed upon the Peloponnesians to send a fleet to Euboean waters (91. 2), they seized the opportunity to revolt offered by the Peloponnesian victory off Eretria (95-6).

The alarm of the Athenians on receiving this news was undoubtedly intensified by their consciousness that the revolt of Abydos (62. 1) and, more

¹ By this route, which climbs to a height of 2,100 feet, the distance from Oropus to Athens is about 30 miles. A traveller in the third century took a longer and more easterly road via Aphidna and the temple of Amphiaras (Müller, *F.H.G.* ii. 256 and *G.G.M.* i. 100); his reference to abundant facilities for rest and refreshment suggests that this had then become the normal route from Athens to Oropus. It is not clear why L. Chandler, *J.H.S.* xlv (1926), 16, believes that the road through Aphidna 'was the way by which the Athenian corn supplies were brought from Euboea'. It is true that a Peloponnesian force stationed at Declea was in a position to prevent the use of both routes, but Thucydides mentions only the Declea route in the passage quoted above (*διὰ τῆς Δεκλειᾶς*), and whereas the Persians withdrew from Attica to Boeotia through Declea in 479 (Hdt. ix. 15. 1), there seems to be no evidence from the fifth century that an important road passed through Aphidna.

² Ehrenberg, op. cit. 275, n. 8, finds in *I.G.* i². 40. 19-28 evidence of Athenian intentions to 'keep down the price of transport via Oropus'. This inscription, however, which belongs to 446/5 and is discussed by Ziebarth, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels*, 123, does not appear to prove more than that the Athenians wished to facilitate communications with their new cleruchy at Histiaea.

³ The Spartans intended that their colony at Heraclea should serve as a base for attacks on Euboea (Thuc. iii. 92. 4), and this danger caused the Athenians some alarm (iii. 93. 1).

recently, of Byzantium (80. 2-4) was endangering the supply route from Pontus (Busolt, op. cit. iii. 2. 1507).¹ Yet the loss of the Euboean market did not prove so catastrophic as was at first feared. The victories won in the Hellespont and Propontis temporarily safeguarded the Pontic route, and the respite gained by this recovery probably enabled the Athenians to increase their merchant navy, with the result that Agis impotently watched from Decelea a stream of corn ships entering the Peiraeus (Xen. *Hell.* i. 1. 35). Euboea was only an emergency source of supply,

though invaluable when Athenian resources were most severely strained. One of the differences between the crisis of 413-412 and that of 405 was that the Euboean market had in the interim ceased to be available.

H. D. WESTLAKE.

King's College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

¹ The supply route from Egypt was also threatened. Some months earlier an enemy squadron operating from Cnidus attempted to intercept Athenian merchant ships sailing from Egypt (35. 2-3), and while Rhodes was the headquarters of the Peloponnesian fleet (44; 60. 2), this traffic may have had to be suspended.

THE EION EPIGRAM

BOTH Aeschines, iii. 183-5, and Plutarch, *Cim.* 7. 4-6, say that after the capture of Eion Cimon was permitted by the demos to set up three statues of Hermes in the agora, each with an ἐπίγραμμα:

On the first

ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι, οἳ ποτε Μήδων
παυσὶν ἐπ' Ἱόνι Στρυμόνος ἀμφὶ ῥόας
λιμόν τ' αἰθωνα κρυερὸν τ' ἐπάγοντες Ἄρρα
πρώτοι δυσμενέων εἶδον ἀμυχανίην.

On the second

ἡγεμόνεσι δὲ μισθὸν Ἀθηναῖοι τάδ' ἔδωκαν
ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν.
μᾶλλον τις τάδ' ἰδὼν καὶ ἐπεσοομένων ἐθέλησεν
ἀμφὶ ξυνοῖσι πράγματα δῆριν ἔχειν.

On the third

ἐκ ποτὲ τῆσδε πόλιος ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσι Μενεσθεὺς
ἡγήτο γάθεον Τρωικὸν ἐς πεδίον
ὄν ποθ' Ὅμηρος ἔφη Δαναῶν πύκα θωρηκτάων
κοσμητῆρα μάχης ἔξοχον ὄντα μολεῖν.
οὕτως οὐδὲν αἰεὶς Ἀθηναῖοισι καλεῖσθαι
κοσμητὰς πολέμου τ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ἡγορέης.

(There are interesting variations of readings in the two citations, but I am not concerned with them here.) These epigrams have been discussed in two excellent papers, by Wade-Gery in *J.H.S.* liii, 1933, 71-95 and by Jacoby in *He-speria*, xiv, 1945, 185-211; see also W. Peek in *Harvard Studies*, suppl. vol. i, 1940, 97-120. I agree with Jacoby in his arguments against Wade-Gery, who accepts Domaszewski's view that only the first of the epigrams was inscribed on one of the Hermae, and that those on the two others are to be identified with the first four lines (on the battle of the

Eurymedon) and the second four lines (on the Cyprus battles of 450-449 B.C.) quoted by Diodorus, xi. 62. 3 as a single poem for Eurymedon (also by Aristides, twice, vol. ii, pp. 209 and 512, ed. Dindorf, and in *Anthol. Pal.* vii. 296). But I disagree with him in reviving the old reconstruction of the poems by Goettling, Richter, and Weidner, by which the third, minus its two last lines which Weidner bracketed,¹ is placed first, and the first and second follow it.

1. The principal argument used against the traditional order is that a poem could not begin ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι: καὶ must refer to another already mentioned. I agree with Jacoby that καὶ cannot have a specific reference to others mentioned on neighbouring monuments (to the men of 490 or of 480-479, for example); but it may have a general reference to well-known heroes of the past. The skolion to Kedon quoted by Aristotle, *Ἀθπ.* 20. 5, is an independent poem:

ἔγχει καὶ Κήδωνι, διάκονε, μηδ' ἐπιλήθου,
εἰ χρὴ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.

The reference is general, to all other enemies of tyrants (and Kedon in fact attacked the Peisistratidae before the Alkmeonidae did at Leipsydryon).² The

¹ Such literary amplification of epigrams inscribed on stone can be paralleled, e.g. by the epitaph on the Corinthians who fell at Salamis (see Tod, *Gk. Hist. Inscr.*, no. 16).

² The order of the words in *Ἀθπ.* makes it clear that τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν is genitive after πρότερον (as

use of *καί* here is in fact not essentially different from its use in such a saying as πάντα γὰρ πέφυκε καὶ ἐλασσοῦσθαι, Thuc. ii. 64. 3.

2. οἱ ποτε Μήδων; κτλ. Again I agree with Jacoby that Wade-Gery presses too hard his argument that the use of *ποτέ* in all epigrams of this kind means that they were composed and published some time after the event celebrated, long enough for it to be regarded as a thing of the past (cf. especially the Phyle epigram, quoted below); it is a reminiscence of Homer.¹ But no poet would use *ποτέ* in a sentence expressly comparing and equating the men of the present with the men of the past whose deeds are themselves said to have been accomplished *ποτέ* (twice, ll. 1 and 3 of the third poem: its author was not very skilful). The repetition of *ποτέ* in what for Jacoby is the fifth line of the poem seems impossible; and even *ἐκεῖνοι*, in this sequence, would at first sight point to the men of the past.

3. Jacoby concedes that an epigram may begin with *ἄρα*; he must, for the second of the 'Marathon' epigrams (Oliver, *Hesp.* ii, 1933, 480 ff.; subsequent literature given by Jacoby in the first part of his article, p. 161, n. 19) begins thus. It is another Homeric reminiscence. The inference implied in *ἄρα* is something like: 'the victory celebrated by this monument was a great one; they must have been fine warriors who won it', or, in an epitaph, 'many died on this campaign; they must have been brave men who gave their lives so willingly'; though it is not so explicit as this. But what is the inference in *ἦν ἄρα κάκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι* from the previous lines in praise of Menestheus as *κοσμητὴρ μάχης*?

What in fact is the connexion between Homer's description of Menestheus, which is quite clear in its meaning and clearly understood by the poet of the epigram—Menestheus was good at marshalling troops—and the endurance of the Athenians at Eion? As Jacoby says

(p. 204), *ταλακάρδιοι* reflects Odysseus' *τλήτε φίλοι*, II. ii. 299: 'the main feature of the siege of Troy was its long duration, which it needed *endurance* to stand; the great speech of Odysseus . . . is wholly concerned with this point of view . . .; with *τλήτε φίλοι* he begins his impressive peroration. This in the opinion of the poet was also the quality of the men who besieged Eion; they too have proved their *τλημοσύνη*, were *ταλακάρδιοι*.' But there is nothing of Menestheus' special skill in this.

There is, then, no difficulty in beginning such a poem with *ἦν ἄρα κάκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι*, οἱ ποτε Μήδων, and a great deal of difficulty in believing that that line followed the four lines about Menestheus. And if we restore the traditional order of the poems, we may keep the last two lines of the third.

A last, and a different, matter. I have felt doubtful whether a contemporary would have said of the men at Eion, *πρῶτοι δυσμενέων εὖρον ἀμηχανίην* (and had still more doubt about the epigram in Diodorus, ἐξ οὗ τ' Εὐρώπην Ἀσίας δίχα πόντος ἐνείμει, κτλ.—*Commentary on Thucydides*, p. 289, n.). Wilamowitz laid down the law, 'wer den Sprachgebrauch der Griechen kennt, ändert ein *πρῶτοι εὖρον* nicht' (as though the Greeks never used *εὖρον* without *πρῶτοι*), which saves a deal of trouble; and certainly attempts at emendation have been disastrous. Jacoby, p. 205, n. 172, who feels the exaggeration of the phrase if interpreted in the ordinary way, argues that *ἀμηχανίη* 'has not a vague and general meaning, but a quite definite and special one: the enemy . . . was made *helpless*'. It is an apt word, the *mot juste*, like *ταλακάρδιοι*, for the event which the poet praises. Perhaps his words are untranslatable, but we can get their exact meaning by a paraphrase: 'they found a way to create a situation from which the enemy could not extricate himself', as he could, though with great losses, at Salamis and Plataea. What the men of Eion did, was, in fact, something new in the history of warfare with the barbarians, comparable only with the fate of Troy.' I do not believe that this is true: *ἀμη-*

Hude and Kenyon), not a partitive with *Kedon* (as Mathieu-Haussouiller).

¹ Note particularly *Od.* iii. 84-5.

χρήν has not this specialized meaning in warfare; and the great exaggeration remains. How much more exact is the Phyle epigram:

τοῦτοδ' ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα στεφάνοις ἐγέραυρε παλαίχθων
 δῆμος Ἀθηναίων, οἱ ποτε τοὺς ἀδίκους
 θεσμοῖς ἀρξάντας πόλεως πρώτος καταπαύειν
 ἤρξαν.

for the honour was confined to the men who had joined the movement at Phyle.¹ If this and the Diodorus epi-

¹ See Raubitschek, *Hesp.* x, 1941, 284-95, for the latest text and discussion. His conclusions

gram (whether for Eurymedon, on Wade-Gery's view, or for Cyprus, as I believe) are contemporary, which perhaps they are, they display an ungenerous intention to praise Cimon at the expense of Themistocles and Aristides; and throw no very pleasant light on Cimon and his friends.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

about the number of names recorded, especially his suggestion that 40 of the 100 were metics, are not convincing.

THE GREEK FOR 'MINIMUM'

THE word ἀναγκαῖος in one of its passive senses is applied to things so restricted in quantity that they are the lowest of their kind. LS⁹ s.v. ii. 4, states that this meaning, 'a bare minimum', is less frequent in the positive than in the superlative. The use in the positive is certainly less well known, and as will appear, has sometimes gone unrecognized. LS⁹ gives two examples only, both from Thucydides. One of these (i. 70. 2), with a preceding negative, is not beyond dispute; the other, ἀ. παρασκευή of vi. 37. 2, translated 'scanty, makeshift', belongs to the type with which this note is concerned.

Examples of this type are more numerous than LS perhaps implies. But it would be idle to insist on their numbers, since the distinction between *restricted* resources and *pressing* circumstances is usually one that makes no difference; e.g. the meaning is the same whether ἀ. in the phrase ἐξ ἀναγκαίου (Thuc. vii. 60. 4) is felt as passive or (with LS) as active. The following, however, are clear and, I think, interesting cases of this peculiar passive sense in Thucydides. In v. 8. 3 Brasidas tried to hide the fact that the armament of his troops was of the 'scratch' variety (ὀπλιῶν ἀναγκαίαν ὄσαν). In ii. 70. 1 βρώσεως περί ἀναγκαίας means 'regarding the extreme paucity of food'. 'Imposed by necessity'—a translation often offered—will not do; the besieged were not *compelled* to eat unnatural food. (Poppo-Stahl approved of 'meagre' as the sense here.) In vii. 69. 3 Nicias

thought his exhortations οὐχ ἱκανὰ μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα. A familiar school edition offers 'not sufficient but *what would just suffice*', an absurdity which usefully illustrates the absence of an exact English equivalent. It is clear that ἀ. indicates a place on the scale of value which is (a) well above zero, but (b) hardly up to the pass-mark of adequacy. Either (a) or (b) may be the notion to be stressed according to the context. Thus ἀ., contrasted above with ἱκανά, is contrasted with ὀλίγα in Lysias xxxi. 18: Philo's victims had little but not nothing, a (bare) subsistence.

Among examples later than Thucydides—Wyse on Isaeus iv. 20 lists some of them—the three following deserve attention;

1. Lysias xxiv. 10: the cripple rides on horseback εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς μακροτέρας τῶν ἀναγκαίων, 'upon journeys longer than the very shortest'. On journeys just long enough to deserve the name of journeys he uses his crutches; for greater distances he must borrow a horse. For sense and construction one may compare § 16 of the same speech: insolence is to be expected not from the needy but from those who possess πολλῶ πλείω τῶν ἀναγκαίων, 'much more than a bare subsistence'. Jebb, however, insists that in § 10 the genitive is partitive: 'for the longer of my necessary journeys'. In this case Lysias would be saying 'two things at once', that the jaunts are (a) compulsory, (b) of some length. Greek idiom and the manner of Lysias make it more

likely that the separate points would be made separately. Secondly, it is no part of the cripple's argument to insist that all his journeys were really necessary. The commentators have perhaps misread § 11, where the speaker says that he is compelled often to use borrowed horses. But he does not say that he is compelled by business or other reasons to leave his shop and take to the road. What he says is that he is compelled to make use of borrowed mounts, if he is to make excursions of any length (as he assumes he is entitled to do); and that the compulsion in question arises from his lameness and from the poverty which prevents his buying a mule.¹

2. Isaeus iv. 20: *προφάσεις . . . ἀναγκαίαις*. The excuses are 'insufficient' (Wyse); they are the poorest excuses which can possibly be called by that name; not quite without substance but certainly *vix satis*. These 'minimal' excuses are, no doubt, in some sense 'make-shift(s)' (Wyse, Forster, Goligher); but there seems to be no really satisfactory English for this Greek word.

3. Demosthenes liv. 17: the laws have sought to counter beforehand *καὶ τὰς ἀναγκαίαις προφάσεις, ὅπως μὴ μείζους γίνωνται*—'even the smallest possible

excuses' for violent conduct, 'lest they become more serious'. Such a 'minimum' excuse would be afforded by abusive language on the part of one's opponent, were it not that all excuse for retaliation by word or blow is, so far as possible, removed by the legal provision for *δίκαι κακηγορίας*. That is Demosthenes' example of τὸ φανότατον, § 19, the most trivial class of offence which the law can recognize. Such offences just register themselves, and no more, on the scale of criminality; then up the scale we go to blows and woundings and murders. The meaning of δ. is confirmed both by *φανότατον* in § 19 and by *μικραὶ προφάσεις* in the parallel passage of Isocrates (xx. 8).

This passage of Demosthenes has been much misunderstood. Taking δ. as active, Sandys and Paley translate 'pleas of necessity', i.e. compelling one to take vengeful action, Wyse (loc. cit.) suggests 'excuses that the courts are constrained to accept', and A. T. Murray (Loeb) and F. C. Doherty seem vaguely to follow Paley. Most recently K. Freeman (*The Murder of Herodes*, p. 119) gives (ignoring *καὶ*): 'the law has anticipated the inevitable excuses'. Now the excuses are not 'inevitable' (even if δ. could mean that), since the law seeks to destroy their validity in advance. Nor is the lower range of offences so provoking that the aggrieved person is *compelled* to resort to violence; for, if so, why should the law go to such trouble to induce him to exercise self-control? Finally (*pace* Wyse) the courts are certainly not compelled to give any degree of approval or acceptance to his actions, if he has taken the law into his own hands. But the chief refutation of these suggestions is really the list of examples already given.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

AN EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENT FROM TANAGRA

At Easter 1939, while I was examining the Byzantine gravestones in the museum at Herakleion,¹ the Curator,

¹ And Mussolini's Italians were marching into Albania, initiating the train of events which has led to delay in publication.

Mr. N. Platon, showed me a copy of the remarkable Christian epitaph which he had uncovered at Tanagra in 1936, and urged me to pay it a visit. On my return to Athens I made haste to do so, and I carried away a good impression of

the inscription and of the symbols below it. Mr. Platon's discovery, apart from its high interest in other respects, will take rank with the epitaphs of Avircius and of Pectorius among major inscriptional sources for the early history of the Eucharist. The following text, from my impression, differs in some details (set forth below) from that in Mr. Platon's copy and transcription, published in *Ἀρχ. Ἐφημερίς*, 1937, pp. 655 ff. which, through his kindness, I have at long last been able to read. I have seen no other discussion of the monument apart from the reference in Creaghan and Raubitschek, *Early Christian Inscriptions from Athens*, p. 16 (= *Hesperia* xvi, p. 16). My brief note on the contents of the inscription is indebted to Mr. Platon's judicious and learned commentary, with most of which I agree.

The inscription is carved on a marble stele (height 148 cm.; width 58–61 cm.; thickness 17 cm.) with triangular pediment. There are traces of acroteria above all three angles of the pediment; the sides of the stele are chiselled, the back rough. The first line occupies the raised lower border of the pediment; there are *paragraphi* after ll. 24 and 27, marking the divisions of the subject-matter. The letters date from about A.D. 400 or a little later; the spare and partial use of abbreviation (nu at the end of genitive plural and of present infinitive active represented by a bar above the penultimate letter, final -αι in *ὀράσθαι*, *ὀλείται*, and *κορέσασθαι* represented by Ϛ, the caudate—in some cases pig-tailed—kappa for καί) and the apostrophe after ΤΑΥΤ in l. 25, but there only, suit this period. Immediately below l. 40 there are three monogrammatic crosses of Latin type, one at the middle point of the field, the two others, slightly lower, midway between it and either edge. Below, and somewhat to the right of the central cross, is a stem from which three vine-leaves sprout, one reaching towards each cross.¹

¹ A symbol within a symbol. The three crosses represent the Trinity and the connexion between cross and vine symbolizes John xv. 5. This connexion is made even more explicit on the monument in *M.A.M.A.* i, no. 213.

Ϛ[Φι]λ[ο]μένης μερόπεσσι κ(αι) ἰσοσμένους τάδε
τεύχειν·

- [ῆ]ν χώρου βροτὸς ἄλλος ἀναξ μετόπισθε γένητε
ἡμετέρης γενεῆς ἐ(κ) τηλόθεν, αἶσιμα τεύχων
ὕμνη μὲν πρῶτιστα Θεὸν μέγαν, εἰτα κομίη
5 πᾶρ τέμενος ἴαθεν Τριάδι πάντων μεδεούση
ἔκτω ἐν ἡματι δῶρα Θεῷ περιλαμένα Χριστῷ
ἀντὶ κασιγνήτων, παίδων δέ τε κ(αι) γενετήρων,
ἀνδρῶν ἡδ' ἀλόχων, πῶν προπάροιθε γεγῶται(ν),
ἄρτους διακοφανεῖς δύο κ(αι) δέκα κ(αι) μέθυ λαρόν
10 ἀκτίσιν ἢ νηδάεσσιν εὐκόκτα· καὶ γὰρ ἀνάγκη
ἐκτελεῖν μεμαῶτα, νεκρῶν δ' ἀποθύμια βέζει(ν).
σήματα δ' ἐγγὺς ὄντα καταφθιμένων ὀράσθαι(αι)
μήποτε χειμέριαισι κατεβομένω(ν) ψεκέδεσσαι
δοτέα λεύκ' ὑπένερθεν ὀϊζύρ' ὥσι καμόντων.
15 τῶν περὶ δευμαίνεν κ(αι) ὀσσομένον μέγα πῆμα
ἔμπεδα δώματ' ἔχειν κ(αι) ἀπήμονα. τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ
φάος
ἦρα φέρειν κατὰ νύκτα· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.
πτωχοῖς δ' ἐκ παρεόντος ἀφυσσόμενον βιότοιο
ἄρκιον αὐτίκα δοῦναι· ἐπεὶ θέμις ἐστὶ κ(αι) αὐτοῖς.
20 δένδρεα δ' ὑψιπέτῃλα πολεῦμεναι ἡδὲ φυλάσσειν,
μηδὲ χρόνος μέλαθρον περιελλομένους λυκάβανος
χείμασιν ἀργαλέοις δυσσχέος ὑπ' ἀνέμοιο
λαθριδῆς ραβδάμυγος ἐπισουσμένης ἀνὰ δῶμα
λευγαλέως ἀμαθύνῃ ὑπ' ἀμβολίαισιν εἰσῖν.
- 25 ταῦτ' ὁσίως τελέειν κ(αι) εὐσεβῶς βιοτεῦν·
ἀνέρι γὰρ πυνυτῷ κ(αι) εὐφρονι πολλὰ κ(αι) εὐθλὰ
γέινοντ' ἐκ καμάτοιο, κλέος δὲ μιν οὐποτ' ὀλεῖτ(αι).
- εἰ δ' ὑπεροπλήσει παραπλάγξει νόημα
ἢ νῦν ἢ μετόπισθεν ἀναξ μεταμῶντα βάζων,
30 κ(αι) τὰδ' ἐκὼν σφετέραισιν ἀτασθαλίαισιν ἀλιξῇ,
μὴ βλος ἔμπεδος εἴη, ἐπ' ἀλγει δ' ἄλγος ἄριστο,
ὕσμεναι δ' ὀλοαῖς κ(αι) πένθει τερόμενον κῆρ
δούλιον ὄζεται ἡμαρ ἀνείρηρ ὑπ' ἀνάγκη.
ὀππόσα τ' ἄλλα τέτυκτε βροτοῖς ὑπὸ δαίμονος
αἴσῃ—
- 35 μὴδ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν ἴκηται, οὐδ' οὐ θέμις οἶδε θανόντων,
δέκτης δ' ἀμφὶ γένοιτο λυλαῖόμενος κορέσασθ(αι)
βρώμης ἡδὲ πότοιο, κύναις δέ τε πάντα δάσοντε
δοτέα κ(αι) σάρκας, κ(αι) ἀμείλιχον ἴσσετ' ὀλεθρον·
κ(αι) μετὰ πότμον αἰστον ἀνηλεᾶ τίσις ποιήν
40 αὐτὸς κ(αι) γένος αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἀθανάτοιο βασιλῆος.

l. 1. P. prints . . . μένης and rightly looks for the name of the dedicator. The edge is chipped and the surface damaged here and it is impossible to fix precise limits for the length of the gap—say, room for 4 to 6 letters. Two places before M the impression shows part of Λ. Φιλομένης is possibly the name. As P. suggests, a man of such learning and literary talent (remember that his background is a Boeotian town and his date about A.D. 400)¹ may well have been Bishop of Tanagra, one of the ten sees in northern Greece at this period.

l. 2. P. copied ΙΧΩΡΟΥ and restores [μῆ] χώρου placing a colon after τηλόθεν in l. 3. It is unnecessary to argue the case for a condition rather than a prohibition here, for the impression makes [ῆ] certain.

² In A.D. 448 Elias, Bishop of Hadrianopolis in Phrygia, confessed at the Council of Constantinople that he could not sign his name (*eo quod nesciam literas*). See Ramsay, *C.B.*, p. 509.

l. 3. ΕΚ was clearly intended, but only ΕΙ was carved. IC are joined by an oblique bar, as if the mason had begun to carve Μ.

l. 14. αἰζήρ' ὄσι A. H. Coxon; αἰζυρῶσι P.

l. 25. P. has εὐσεβάς.

l. 28. P. copied and reads ὑπεροπλείης τ' ἀρα. After C the impression shows what looks like part of ΙΠΙ, damaged above and to right. In spite of -αυσι(ν) in ll. 13, 24, 30 I have no doubt that the engraver carved ὑπεροπλείησι παραπλάγξει.

l. 32. P. reads δολοαῖς as for δολοόσσαις.

l. 36. P. copied Α ΙΚΤΗC and transcribes λείκτης ('καὶ εἰς φαγγρὸν καὶ ποτόν, ἂν καὶ θὰ ἐπιθυμῇ νὰ χορτάσῃ, νὰ εἶναι μόνον λιχοῦθης'). On the impression P.'s Α is Δ, his Ι is a crack in the stone extending upwards to the line above, and between the two Ε appears clearly. Read δέκτης and add this to P.'s list of Homeric echoes (*Od.* iv. 248).

The early Christians of the Greek East, with no sense of incongruity or consciousness of 'spiritual outrage',¹ borrowed the epic metre and diction which had become fashionable for the more pretentious type of 'provincial' pagan epitaph before the third century of our era. Christian epitaphs of the same verbose and archaizing pattern continued to be carved in Asia Minor till A.D. 400 and later. In Greece the prolixity of the Tanagra epitaph strikes an unusual note, and makes one wonder whether the composer was not an immigrant from Asia Minor or Syria—an easy supposition if he was Bishop of Tanagra, for the clergy were ever mobile.² These epitaphs give abundant evidence that Homer was still thumbed, or at least quoted, in the Greek schools. But he was not always understood; thus, as P. points out, ἀποθύμια in l. 11 of our epitaph must mean the exact opposite of Homer's ἀποθύμια in *Il.* xiv. 261. Can the composer have connected its root with θύω or θυμιάω?

The epitaph refers to a heritable χῶρος (l. 2), to a church (τέμενος l. 5), presumably dedicated to the Trinity, and to certain tombs (σήματα l. 12, further defined as δώματα l. 16). Provision having been made in ll. 12-16 for the care of the sepulchral building, I see no way of avoiding P.'s conclusion that the further and separate provisions of

ll. 21-4 refer to the fabric of the church (μέλαθρον l. 21, δῶμα l. 23).

The relation to each other of χῶρος, church, and sepulchral building is not clear. There is a bare possibility that χῶρος here has the meaning of landed estate, including a family burial vault (μνήμα προγονικόν) and a memorial chapel. But analogy, I think, strongly favours the view that χῶρος is the family burial-ground, forming part of the cemetery attached to a church of the Trinity at Tanagra; χῶρος then corresponds to τόπος or περίβολος as used in Phrygia in the third century of our era. The term need not be technical; for the composer of these verses Homer's διαμετρήτω ἐνὶ χῶρῳ (*Il.* iii. 344) would suggest a suitable description of his burial-plot—he may even have remembered the νεκύων . . . χῶρος of *Il.* viii. 491, and forgotten its context. On the view that the epitaph refers to a family mausoleum in the church graveyard, the inclusion in a family epitaph of ll. 21-4, giving directions for the maintenance of the church fabric, again points to the bishop.

The composer, by his use of *paragraphi*, calls attention to the three sections into which the inscription is divided. The dedication of the tomb, giving the names of the persons referred to in ll. 7-8 as already buried or destined to be buried in it, was on a separate stone; here we have (a) the dedicator's directions for the care of the tomb and of the adjoining church, and provisions for the due tending of the dead (ll. 1-24); (b) an injunction to fulfil these instructions with a hint of blessings to follow (ll. 25-7); (c) an elaborate curse on a future owner of the ground (ἀναξ = κύριος) who treats these instructions as superfluous (μεταμῶνια βάζων) and evades his duty (ll. 28-40). The second and third sections follow a traditional pattern, derived from pagan sources; it is noteworthy that here, after a selected series of the usual pagan fulminations (ll. 31-8), the *coup de grâce* (ll. 39-40) is delivered from the Christian arsenal. The words ἐπ' ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος refer to the ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου (quoted thus on inscriptions)³ of Luke xxiii. 42; the first ap-

¹ Deissmann's description of Nonnus' rendering of the Fourth Gospel into hexameters.

² The words πῶν προπάροιθε γεγῶτων of l. 8 will in that case be proleptic.

³ e.g. *T.A.P.A.* lvii, 1926, p. 204.

pearance of Christ the King as Judge of offenders against graves is the appeal *πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν Θεόν* at Apameia and *πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα Θεόν καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ κρισίμῳ ἡμέρᾳ* at Eumeneia, both on epitaphs dating soon after the middle of the third century of our era.¹ Later, formulae of the type *δώσει τῷ Θεῷ λόγον τῷ μέλλοντι κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς* (Philomelium, early fourth century), with variants, became common.²

The supreme interest of the inscription centres in its first section, containing the dedicator's instructions. The graves are to be preserved from damage by weather (ll. 12-16); inside them a cruse is to be lit *κατὰ νύκτα*, which is probably to be understood of the darkness of the tomb and gloom of the underworld rather than given a strict temporal reference (ll. 16, 17); alms are to be given to the poor—obviously for the peace of the souls of the departed (ll. 18, 19); to keep the church weather-tight (ll. 21-4) will help towards the same end; to crown all, on behalf of (*ἀντί* = *ὕπέρ*) the relatives referred to in ll. 8, 9, 'twelve

quoit-shaped loaves and dainty wine' (l. 10) are to be offered at the Church of the Trinity 'on the sixth day' (l. 6). As P. has observed, 'on the sixth day' here can mean nothing but 'on Fridays', and the inscription preserves a unique record of a weekly celebration of the Eucharist on behalf of the dead of a particular family for the peace of their souls. The new term *δισκοφανεῖς* contains no new information; it is the composer's quaint equivalent for the (*ἀρτοι*) *στρογγυλοειδεῖς* of Epiphanius (*Anch.* 57). The number 'twelve' recalls the 'twelve baskets' of Matthew xiv. 20, etc. The description *ἀκτίσιν ἢ νιφάδεσσιν εὐκότα* (l. 10) applied chiasmically to the wine and the bread means that the wine is to be sparkling (but not in the modern sense) and the bread white as the driven snow.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

¹ Ramsay, *C.B.*, nos. 394, 353. See also *Anatolian Studies presented to Buckler*, pp. 15 ff., *M.A.M.A.* vi, no. 225.

² See *Revue de Philologie*, xxxvi, 1912, p. 69.

HORACE, ODES I. 28. 7-8

(1) THE 'DEATH' OF TITHONUS

WHEN I raised (in *C.R.* lix. 44-5) the difficulty about Horace's apparent reference here to the death of Tithonus, it did not occur to me that *occidit* in l. 8 need not necessarily imply death. In *C.R.* lxi. 49 Professor D. S. Robertson says that '*occidit* is not quite "died"': and Professor H. J. Rose on p. 50 defends the manuscript reading in the same way, confirming the point by reference to the meaning of *occidit* in *Odes*, iii. 8. 18 and iv. 4. 70. This seems thoroughly sound. In the present ode, however, *occidit* is immediately preceded by the emphatic *morituro* at the end of l. 6. Further, the sentence which follows the reference to Tithonus and the others is *sed omnes una manet nox/et calcanda semel via leti*. The difficulty is mitigated by the other arguments adduced by Robertson and Rose, but that *occidit* here does not imply death is too much to believe.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS.

University College, Swansea.

(2) NEITHER TITHONUS NOR ORPHEUS

From *C.R.* lxi. 49-50 I infer that Professors Robertson and Rose do in fact accept my demonstration that *in auras* cannot mean 'to heaven' as hitherto here supposed. I thought I had further demonstrated that this was a stock expression and meant merely 'into the air'; but evidently neither of these scholars accepts this conclusion, nor do they agree with one another in their far from simple accounts of the picture conveyed to them by this only too simple phrase. According to them it here means 'into' certain particular 'breezes'. Tithonus, Professor Robertson tells us, 'was carried to the shores of Ocean, to the *ὠκεανίδες αἶθραι* which, in Pindar's vision, breathed round the Islands of the Blest'. This is indeed a novel view that has now been devised as an alternative for the old rendering 'to heaven'. These islands are in the West, and the winds that breathe about them are west winds. 'Cogitanda . . .

uidetur uia ab occidentali terrae ora . . . ducens' says (e.g.) Disson on Pind. *Ol.* 2. 70; it is the regular and the natural inference; it is confirmed, for example, by the original account of this paradise of Rhadamanthys in *Odyssey* iv. 563-9 (*Ζεφύροιο*, 567); cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 742-51. For my part I agree with Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *Tithonus*, 1517. 20, that the writer of *hymn. Hom.* v. 227 (the authority for Robertson's 'to the shores of Ocean') meant the East, where Dawn rises; and therefore had no such paradise in mind.

Admitting that *remotus in auras* is vague, Robertson nevertheless finds it a phrase 'of haunting charm'. Surely that must be a strange argument for authenticity in Horace, who neither achieves nor seeks to achieve vague phrases of haunting charm; and in particular, there is no haunting charm in *conuiua deorum* or any other phrase in this elegant and pointed descriptive catalogue. For me, at least, the beauty of this poem as a whole lies in its equable and limpid plangency, an effect which the least obscurity or even vagueness would destroy.

One other negative also I did think that I had demonstrated, namely (on p. 104, col. i, lines 21-5) that *occidit* in line 7 of this poem cannot possibly de-

¹ I was there, of course, arguing against Mr. Griffiths's deduction that since it must here mean 'died' it was 'inexact'; but what I wrote is obviously equally applicable as against this other view, which had occurred to me as one that nobody would ever maintain.

² Rose's *remissus* appears to have been intended for an incidental improvement. That word is, of course, ruled out by the following *admissus*, with which it would make antithesis but not point.

THE AXES AGAIN

THERE are three difficulties about the axe-contest in the *Odyssey*.

- (a) What was meant to be done?
- (b) Where was Odysseus standing?
- (c) Why did the suitors not seize the axes in the fighting?
- (a) has never been quite adequately answered: many people suppose that Homer himself, like Telemachus,¹ had never seen the contest and was describing something he did not fully understand.

¹ *Od.* xxi. 123.

note anything short of death.² This also, to my great astonishment, both Robertson and Rose deny. I can hardly suppose that anything could be more decisive than a flat contradiction in terms; however, here are two other considerations each of which is also in my judgement decisive. (i) The climax of the first sentence in the single word *morituro* is patently taken up by the second sentence in its opening word *occidit*. (ii) The following context confirms the preceding by *Orco* and by *omnes una manet nox*; for not *nox* only but *omnes una* proves that the person referred to in 8 did not merely 'drop out of sight' (Rose) and 'not quite die' (Robertson), but died physically just like all the rest of us.

On any showing *in auras* here is a formidable difficulty. *Sithoniusque reuectus*² in *auras* represented the one and only step that I could take on the assumption that *in auras* was sound. Yet if there is corruption in the line, that may have affected its concluding words; in which case the whole necessity to find some fourth name disappears, and therefore with all the arguments of my final paragraph on p. 105. I feel bound now to state that I have in fact, in the meantime, come to just this conclusion. In doing so I revert to my original reaction; 'not space enough for Aurora's husband' (p. 103 *fin.*)—no, nor for anybody. My new reading is now in a printer's hands, to appear eventually with certain other readjustments. Should someone else happen to better that before it is published, I shall adopt his view.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

Others suppose that the arrow was to go through the holes of the hatchets detached from the helms: but Homer definitely describes the helms as being buried in the ground, apparently in one line. Others suppose two lines of axes; or that the arrow was somehow shot between the curves of double axes.

(b) Butcher and Lang consider the 'oudos' to have been the dais at the end of the hall; but the object of Odysseus seems to have been to keep the suitors from the door,² which would imply that the

² *Od.* xxii. 76, 172.

word had its normal meaning of threshold or doorstep.

(c) Woodhouse can only suppose that the author forgets all about the axes. If the axes are placed along the floor of the hall itself, that is the only possible explanation. I would like to offer another suggestion.

(a) The axes were placed in one line; the helms were only buried deep enough to keep them straight, and the blades would stand between 3 and 5 feet above ground.

The bow would have been discharged in a squatting position, as shown in several paintings: hence the line of aim would be low, and would need to be dead straight. If not straight, the arrow would either hit the floor or hit a blade of an axe: if it were aimed perfectly, it would go out of the front door.¹ Note, both Achilles and Diomedes² are struck in the heel: low aim must have been common.

Most important of all, the axes would be buried not in the hall but in the courtyard: the suitors would hardly have been eating so nonchalantly³ if arrows were flying about inside the hall. Therefore

(b) Odysseus would be standing on the threshold of the hall, aiming outwards. Before shooting Antinous, he would only need to turn round:⁴ and he could prevent the suitors escaping through the front, though he could not cover the side passage.⁵

(c) The suitors could not seize the axes, because Odysseus covered the only exit into the courtyard.

There seems to be nothing in the account to make this explanation impossible.

H. W. STUBBS.

University College, Exeter.

TERENCE, *HEAUT.* 46

nam nunc novas qui scribunt nil parcent seni:
siquae laboriosast, ad me curritur;
si lenis est, ad alium defertur gregem.
in hac est pura oratio. experimini
in utramque partem ingenium quid possit meum.

THE familiar interpretation of line 46, referring *pura oratio* to the purity of the poet's Latin, seems to me quite indefensible: readers have been misled perhaps by the false analogy of Caesar's *puri sermonis*, and by too frequently divorcing the line from its context.

In the first place such a sense is completely irrelevant. The veteran actor who speaks the prologue is contrasting the more popular type of comedy, full of movement and action, and strenuous to act (*laboriosa*), with the quieter Terentian type (*stataria*), in which the interest centres in the dialogue. 'The action of this play', says Ambivius in effect, 'is not carried on by a lot

of energetic slapstick, but is worked out purely and simply by the dialogue. Give me a hearing in a quiet type of play for a change.' Then *pura oratio*, I suggest, means dialogue pure and simple, dialogue unspoiled by excessive activity.

In the second place this interpretation suits the language better. The word *oratio* occurs in eighteen other passages in Terence, and in none of these does it carry the meaning of 'style'. Indeed it is contrasted with *stilus* in *And. 12 dissimili oratione sunt factae ac stilo*, on which Donatus aptly remarks that *oratio* refers to the content of the poetry, *stilus* to its diction. *Ph. 5* is similar: Terence's critics say that his dialogue has no imagination, and his writing is feeble. In every other instance *oratio* refers to an actual speech or remark made by another character. Clearly, then, *oratio* in Terence denotes the content of what is said, and not the style of the writing. And *pura* will have its common idiomatic sense of 'free from any obstruction or alien element', i.e. in this case 'unmarred by violent action'.

D. A. KIDD.

University of Aberdeen.

HORACE, *ODES* iv. 7. 13

damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae.

FOUR interpretations have from time to time been given of *damna caelestia*. (1) The majority take it as referring to the phases of the moon, and translate *caelestia* 'in the sky'. But, as Kiessling remarks, the phases of the moon have nothing to do with the passage of the seasons; and besides, where else would you expect to see them but in the sky? The epithet is pointless, and therefore un-Horatian.

(2) Kiessling explains the phrase as 'the death of Nature on the return of winter'. But this is an event that happens only once a year, and ill suits the plural *damna*. Besides, the point of *caelestia* still remains unexplained.

(3) Lambinus refers it to seasonal plagues, caused by the weather (*caelestia*), and he is followed by Villeneuve in the Budé edition. But all the seasons do not produce plagues, and Horace has all the seasons in turn under review. Surely *damna caelestia* takes up in some way the idea which the preceding four lines express, namely that each season in turn passes away.

(4) The true explanation, as I see it, was given by Doering, although he does not appear to have convinced his successors. It is a commonplace of ancient poetry that each season is characterized by the constellations that are prominent in the night sky during it, and as each constellation temporarily disappears from view at its heliacal setting it marks clearly the passing of its season. *Damna caelestia* then means the successive disappearance of constellations from the night sky. But the sky loses them only for a couple of months or less (*celeris lunae*), and their heliacal rising restores them once more to our view. Translating freely then, the meaning is 'But the months quickly bring back the stars that the sky loses'.

D. A. KIDD.

University of Aberdeen.

¹ *Od.* xxi. 422.

² *Il.* xi. 377. Non-Homeric references are unfortunately unavailable at the moment.

³ *Od.* xxii. 9 ff.

⁴ *Ib.* 4.

⁵ *Ib.* 135 ff.

PROPERTIUS iv. ii. 37

suppetat hoc, pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo mundus demissis institor in tunicis.

N here reads *suppat* (no mark of contraction can be discerned in Birt's facsimile), while all other manuscripts give the reading shown above, which has given difficulty to editors both in point of syntax and of sense. Butler and Butler-Barber make no comment.

I make no claim of originality for the conjecture here given; it occurred to me some time ago, but had (as I afterwards discovered) been made long before, though not published, by E. H. Alton, and before him by a scholar of whose identity I am not aware. But, as it occurs in no edition or apparatus criticus which I know, I give it in order that it may be brought to the notice of scholars.

The true reading is *sub petaso* 'wearing a sun-hat'. The line is thus made parallel to 25: 'da falcem (in my hand) et torto frontem mihi comprime faeno (on my head)'. It should further be noted that Vertumnus carries his distinguishing mark on his head in 29: 'at cum est imposta corona'; 31: 'cinge caput mitra'; and 45: 'nec flos ullus hiat pratis, quin ille decenter / impositus fronti langueat ante meae'.

The phrase can be paralleled only by Plautus, *Amph.* 145: 'torulus inherit aureus sub petaso' (in a different connexion), but *sub galea* 'wearing a helmet' is found several times, e.g. Ovid, *Trist.* v. x. 25: 'sub galea pastor iunctis pice cantat avenis'; Sil. It. ii. 345-6: 'nec vero torrent puerilia protinus ora / sub galea et pressae properata casside malae'; and Arnobius, *Nat.* vi. 25: 'militari sub galea'.

The corruption may have arisen as follows: assuming that the archetype had **SYPPETASO-PISCESCALAMO**, the copyist's eye might have missed **PISCES**, and he might thus have written the **C** of **CALAMO**, leading to **SYPPETASOC**, from which **SYPPETATHOC** could have been derived, as a clumsy means of mending sense and metre. N's reading may thus be taken as the remnant of a doubtful word.

An excellent proof of the reading proposed is given by a bronze statue from Pompeii of a fisherman with rod and line wearing a *petasus*, which is in the National Museum at Naples (Naples 825 (4994), *Guida del Museo Nazionale di Napoli*, p. 204), and illustrated by Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. *piscatus*, *piscatura*.

W. R. SMYTH.

University College,
Swansea.

STATIUS, *Silvae* I. ii. 183

quas ego non gentes, quae non face corda iugali
iugali M, iugavi other MSS.

VOLLMER here reads *iugavi* without comment; Frère, accepting the aposiopesis, retains *iugali*, as does Phillimore. It is true that some instances of harsh aposiopesis occur in the *Silvae*, e.g. v. iii. 12; but to me it appears intolerable here. Yet I am not disposed to accept *iugavi*, which has all the appearances of a puzzled scribe's correction.

Assuming *iugali* to be an anagrammatic corruption, we might well read *ligavi*, comparing *Silvae* v. i. 137: 'quisnam impacata consanguinitate ligavit / Fortunam invidiamque deus?'; Ovid, *Met.* ix. 548: 'quae cum tibi sit iunctissima, iunctor esse / expetit, et vinclo tecum propiore ligari'; id. i. 25: 'quae postquam evoluit caecoque exemit acervo, / dissociata locis concordiae pace ligavit'; id. *Trist.* ii. 377: 'quis nisi Maeonides Venerem Martemque ligatos / narrat?'

Anagrammatic lections are rare in the manuscripts of the *Silvae*, but the following may be noted: I. ii. 103 *nitidae* A*, *nitidae* M; III. i. 60 *hecateidas* A, *echateidas* M; while corrections based on this assumption include III. v. 57 *Trachinia* Domitius, *intracia* P; IV. i. ii. 19 *clavum* Ellis, *calvum* M; IV. iv. 79 *egerit* Avantius, *eriget* M; v. ii. 40 *suspecta* Politian, *suscepta* M; v. ii. 123 *servantem* Phillimore, *versantem* M.

W. R. SMYTH.

University College,
Swansea.

REVIEWS

THE HOMERIC EPICS

Rhys CARPENTER: *Folk-Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics*. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XX.) Pp. 198. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1946. Cloth, 14s. net.

IN this highly paradoxical book the author seeks to isolate and appraise the three elements—folk-tale, saga, and fiction—of which the Homeric epics are compounded. The terms were first used in this connexion by Chadwick in *The Heroic Age*, a book based on a wide

comparative study of the heroic poetry of various countries and periods; Mr. Carpenter confines himself to the Homeric epics, save for occasional references to medieval poems cited as parallels. With his conclusion that the *Iliad* consists mainly of fiction none will quarrel; all the scenes that make it a supreme poem, from the Assembly in A to the Ransoming in Ω, are the work of imagination alone. To the role of saga, however, Mr. Carpenter is something less than just, especially in denying to the Tale of Troy and to the Confederacy of the Greeks

under a supreme war-lord any foundation in historical reality. Everyone will agree that saga is not versified chronicle; W. P. Ker and Chadwick have familiarized us with the fact that it is weak in chronology and in particular that here and there in German medieval epic Eormenric, Attila, and Theodoric figure as contemporaries. To conclude from this that all the chronology of all saga (and specifically that of the saga embodied in the *Iliad*) is equally dishevelled is to go too far; Mr. Carpenter ignores many of the implications of his much more relevant comparison of the *Iliad* with the *Chanson de Roland*. Here we have a poem of the early twelfth century which recounts an event—a trivial but historical event—in the withdrawal of Charlemagne's troops from Spain in A.D. 778. Of the means by which the tradition reached the poet we are as ignorant as we are in the case of the *Iliad*; but with the *Life of Charlemagne* written by his younger contemporary Einhard in our hands we can check precisely the relation of saga to history. We note, first, that both the retreat and the fate of the rear-guard are historical events; secondly, that the two identifiable characters of the poem, Charlemagne and Roland, were contemporaries and were actually associated with the retreat, and, finally, that the withdrawal was made over the Pyrenees, i.e. in the region in which history tells us that the army of Charlemagne was operating. On the question therefore of persons (admittedly only of Charlemagne and Roland, with Archbishop Turpin as a possible third, and on that of chronology and *locale* the *Chanson de Roland* is blameless. It is true that the pass through which Charlemagne's troops withdrew is unidentified; it must apparently have been narrower than that down which the knights of the *Chanson* ride. That this latter is the Pass of Roncesvalles has been accepted as certain ever since its identification by Gaston Paris.

We may note another cycle of heroic poetry which Mr. Carpenter does not mention—the Kossovo poems of the Yugoslavs. Here again we have an his-

torical event, this time one of tragic importance, the names of some of the principal persons involved and the theatre of action; thus much survives Chadwick's searching and most instructive analysis.

The independent accounts in prose which illuminate both the *Chanson de Roland* and the Kossovo poems are lacking in the case of Mycenae; the archaeological record, however, is remarkably full and Mr. Carpenter's treatment of it is inadequate. He ignores the roads made to take wheeled traffic which diverge from Mycenae in the direction of Nauplia and of points on the Corinthian Gulf, on whose northern shore they resumed their course (as in one case at least the remains of a Mycenaean road testify) to another great Mycenaean centre, Thebes. Here we have evidence of such a central organization as ancient Greece was never to know again; and since transport of goods in Greece until the most recent times has always been by ship or pack-mule, the presumption is that the roads were designed primarily to take chariotry and that the centre of the organization had an interest in the defence of the Peloponnese as a whole. And that centre was the great fortified site which dropped out of mind and almost out of existence with the close of the Bronze Age. Nor were Mycenae's interests confined to the mainland. Her widely scattered settlements overseas, whether independent (Rhodes, Cyprus, Samos, Crete, presumably Miletus, Colophon, and Mylasa) or under alien supremacy (Gurob, Ugarit), testify to the economic importance of her trade relations, and may in some cases have called for protection or assistance. The *Catalogue of Ships*, though like all orally transmitted documents in verse it was subjected to a gradual process of renovation long before it was written down, nevertheless retains items which are explicable only by the distribution of the seats of power in the Bronze Age and wholly inconsistent with subsequent groupings. Moreover, it exhibits military strength reckoned in terms of ships; it is reasonable to infer the existence, if not of an 'empire', at least of overseas

interests worth defending by a common effort. These are pointers to the existence of a confederacy which might well be presided over by a King of Kings; and it is hard to see how except by tradition such a state of affairs should be presupposed in the Tale of Troy. Mycenae fell not later than c. 1100 B.C.; in the Dark Age which ensued no such situation could have been invented.

Returning to the *Chanson de Roland*, we ask why this theme should have been resuscitated in the early twelfth century. At that date another great effort was made to expel the infidel from Spain. Saragossa was besieged and for long its fate hung in the balance; at last it fell to the Christian forces. It has been plausibly suggested that the poem should be dated to the years of anxiety which preceded its fall; we may at least feel fairly certain that it was the renewed struggle in the same region that brought the ancient story to the fore. What more likely than the struggles and dangers which must have attended the Aeolic and Ionic colonization of the Anatolian coast to have revived interest in the unforgotten Tale of Troy? To any such view Mr. Carpenter's interpretation of the facts is opposed. That the *Iliad* is staged on the actual plain of Troy he admits, as also that 'Homer' (himself or themselves) was acquainted with that stretch of country; nay more, he selected it for the scene of his epic. That the war which is his theme was fought there is, however, Homer's fiction; its real theatre was Egypt, and it was waged partly by Akaiwasha (Achaioi), who took part in the great Libyan invasion of the Delta c. 1225 B.C., and partly by the Denyen (who may be Danaoi), who formed one element in the motley host of the attempted Land and Sea invasion which was foiled by Ramses III c. 1190. The latter is Mr. Carpenter's favourite. 'Obviously', he writes (p. 62), 'this event coincides surprisingly with the essential nucleus of the heroic legend of the expedition to Troy.' That Odysseus' twice-told tale of a Cretan raid on Egypt in which he was captured may well be derived from a tradition of

the Libyan adventure (in which Tursha and Shakalsha also took part) the reviewer has long believed, though we cannot tell what part of the Achaian world was involved. Odysseus speaks in the character of a Cretan, and Akaiwasha, as Hall long ago and Schachermeyr more recently have pointed out, looks like a Cretan version of the name. The Achaians of Crete, Rhodes, and possibly Cyprus must all have felt a considerable interest in Egypt, though that does not exclude a contingent from the Peloponnese as well. Whether or no the Denyen were Danaoi, it is interesting to note that the Akaiwasha do not figure in the Land and Sea raid—possibly, though of course only conjecturally, because, taking advantage of the collapse of the Hittite empire and the general chaos in Anatolia, they were engaged in the siege of Troy (= Hissarlik VII A. It is sad to see the Bunarbashi will-o'-the-wisp revived, even if only under the heading of fiction.)

Some of the salient points of the first half of the book have now been reviewed at a length which is perhaps tedious; but the archaeological arguments on which so much speculation is based contain a number of loose, vague, and sometimes inaccurate statements which give a misleading idea of the available evidence. The examination of these demanded time and space, and of the latter none remains for a discussion of the chapters which deal with the *Odyssey*. Their main object is to show that the figure of Odysseus is ultimately derived from the folk-tale figure of the Bear's Son, traced by a recent German investigator, Panzer, 'in almost every part of Europe and several sectors of Asia' (pp. 138-9). Beowulf was another such, and the close similarity of his adventures to some of those of Odysseus shows that these have a common origin in Europe. It may be so, but for all his plastic care (and Mr. Carpenter has expended it liberally) I cannot feel that he has brought the great Odysseus to a bear.

H. L. LORIMER.

Oxford.

RELIGION IN HERODOTUS

G. C. J. DANIELS: *Religieuze-historische Studie over Herodotus*. Pp. 202. Antwerp: Standaard-Boekhandel, 1946. Paper, 180 fr.

SINCE Herodotos lived in an age of transition between the old pieties of the sixth and early fifth centuries and the sceptical era which saw the Peloponnesian War, he shows clear traces of contrary tendencies. Some moderns, over-emphasizing one side or another of his work, have made him out a rationalist or an old-fashioned and credulous pietist, a pessimist or an optimist, and so forth. Daniels, who has a wholesome regard for facts, has very carefully read through the *History* and classified relevant passages, subjecting them to a thorough analysis. His result is that Herodotos on the whole was a conservative, not much influenced by the Sophists, but neither credulous nor a blind acceptor of whatever tradition told him. He was a polytheist, but his gods all work together; they follow, not an irrational fate, but an intelligible rule, that pride shall be humbled and punishment follow wrongdoing—and on this principle the great events of history are to be interpreted. Their intervention is not of the direct and physical sort postulated in mythology, which for Herodotos is mere invention of poets or other irresponsible persons. They do not, for example, make storms arise or beget children by mortal women; never-

theless their governance of the universe is a reality.

Concerning the doings of men, apart from divine influence (oracles, in which Herodotos firmly believed, omens, and so forth), the historian has his criteria of probability, still imperfect but beyond the elementary stage of merely subjective preference of one account over another; he is half-way (p. 194) from the *naïveté* of the earliest logographers to the critical methods of Thucydides.

Though very good on the whole, the analysis has some slight faults. Not enough is allowed (e.g. at p. 147) for the influence of folk-tales on Herodotos, who, although the first great social anthropologist, naturally had not at his elbow the immense apparatus of parallels which enables a modern to recognize and discount mere stock stories told of one prominent person after another. There is an occasional slip; on p. 41, the runner who saw Pan is misnamed Pheidippides, a blunder which seems to be immovably fixed in elementary textbooks; p. 88 seems to imply that Arion's dolphin took him under the sea, not on its surface; p. 191, as the result of a hasty reading of vii. 163 (not 162, as given in the text), makes Theron, instead of the Carthaginians, attack Gelon. Neither these nor the few and slight misprints detract seriously from the value of a very good monograph. H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

EURIPIDES

André RIVIER: *Essai sur le Tragique d'Euripide*. Pp. 240. Lausanne, Rouge, 1944. Paper, 6 Sw. fr.

IN two introductory chapters R. protests against the tendency to estimate Euripides primarily as a philosopher or else as a psychologist; a dramatic poet should be judged as such, and the right way to approach his plays is to look in each case for 'le dessein fondamental', the action (giving that term a broad sense) which gives them unity and dramatic significance. These are admirable principles, so far as they go, and they

lead R. to make a clear distinction between tragedies and such non-tragic plays as the *Ion*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Electra*, *Orestes*, which he rightly refuses to regard as 'tragédies manquées'. In view of his theme, he concentrates attention mainly on six plays, which alone he regards as tragic and also as the technical masterpieces of the poet. It will be a shock to some readers to find certain plays excluded, while the *Alcestis* and the *Iphigenia in Aulis* are ranged with the *Medea*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Bacchae*, and (on a slightly lower

level of achievement) the *Heracles*. They may think that R. has not always been successful in his search for 'le dessein fondamental'.

It becomes clear as the book proceeds that R. approaches the tragedies as a Catholic who finds in Euripides an intuition of divinity, omnipotent, unaccountable, and personal, which demands awe, submission, and adoration from men, even in the moment of destruction. Thus he, no less than Aeschylus, was for his compatriots 'un médiateur capable de les conduire à Dieu'. Intermittent but alone creative of tragedy, this intuition culminated in the *Bacchae*. Now we have been told that the *Bacchae* is a return to the gods, that it is an attack on the gods, and (more recently) that we should regard Dionysus as an impersonal force. For R. the significance of Dionysus lies precisely in the fact that he is personal (Maritain is quoted on 'la relation inexprimable et terrifiante de personne à personne entre Dieu et l'homme') and that his triumph rouses in us 'le sens du sacré' which is the true basis of religious sentiment.

Euripides has so often been presented to us as a humanist that it is perhaps worth seeing how he looks as the forerunner of a non-liberal Christianity. As such the reviewer finds him hard to recognize and feels that R. has taken a rather remote view of the plays, seeking and finding in them a tragic theme which fits a preconceived philosophy. The point cannot be argued in a brief review. But it is perhaps significant that R.

never considers what the god of the *Bacchae* represents, in human life and society, other than arbitrary power (he is once referred to as 'le dieu de la bienheureuse ivresse'), and that the content of the choruses, with all their complexity of thought and feeling, is never examined at all. In the *Medea* his insistence on the complete externality of the demoniac force working in the heroine leads R. to deny that she displays 'un jeu de sentiments analysables' or that the reactions of Creon, Jason, and Aegeus can be explained otherwise than by a process of enchantment. His estimates of character seem often to be sentimentally distorted in the interests of his theme: Pentheus is the god's most noble adversary, Admetus worthy of the sacrifice of Alcestis, Hippolytus unself-conscious (not *αεμνός*?) in his first scene and utterly serene in his last (despite 1415 and 1441). Such tragic content as the *Iphigeneia in Aulis* possesses resides, surely, in the illusion of the heroine that she is really saving Hellas (1417 ff.). But here, as elsewhere, R. seems immune to the bitter flavour of Euripidean irony.

R. has a thorough acquaintance with the literature of the subject in French and German, and (up to 1939) in English. His book is carefully argued and contains many judicious and penetrating remarks. But his judgement seems to the reviewer to be better displayed in his criticisms of other scholars than in the elaboration of his own theme.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Birkbeck College, London.

THE SOCIAL OUTLOOK OF NEW COMEDY

PAUL SHANER DUNKIN: *Post-Aristophanic Comedy. Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at both Athens and Rome.* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xxxi, nos. 3-4.) Pp. 192. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Paper, \$2.50.

STUDY carefully your *Life in Ancient Athens*, especially the chapter on citizenship law and the discreet section on Hetairai. Then, and not till then, read Menander; and, for the female charac-

ters, ask yourself not, is she fair or black, kind or shrewish, sketchily or well and sympathetically drawn, but, where was she born? If abroad, then she is a Courtesan, spelt with a capital C to show that Menander only dealt in types; if she is subsequently found to be the daughter of a citizen, she is a Pseudo-Courtesan. I am not exaggerating: for Mr. Dunkin not only Chrysis in *Samia*, but Glykera in *Perikeiromene* is a Pseudo-Courtesan (I cannot help thinking of Dr. Johnson's warning to

Boswell: 'Sir, do not accustom your mind to confuse virtue and vice'), and the whole problem of the two plays, solved by happy accidents, is how to get them properly married. It is not, then, surprising to read: 'Menander seldom if ever took her (the Courtesan) from actual life. . . . But even a fictitious *fille-de-joie* who lives only on paper proved too much [too much, that is, for the comfort of his social outlook], . . . and he was still uneasy in her presence. Forced back upon his imagination, he brought out a girl who perhaps has never existed anywhere, but she is respectable and "in love"'; while of Abrotonon he says 'for all the kindness of her deed, her words must still be those of a "bad woman"', and for this he quotes *Epitr.* 365 (K²) and 370-3. In his introduction Mr. Dunkin writes: 'in the course of the following study it has seemed necessary to say some pretty harsh things about the social outlook of two justly celebrated poets. But this is not to call in question the position of Menander and Terence in the front rank of dramatic poets of all time.' He does not see that much of his criticism is in fact literary criticism, and, if just, would prove both to be writers of a conventional comedy which not only could not interest now, but was at no time alive.

But, though I think that Mr. Dunkin does not understand either Menander or Terence, it would be unfair to leave it at that; for he intends 'only a study of social outlook', and 'to the rare art of literary criticism' he makes no pretence. He states his own position thus:

'the only really meritorious social outlook is that of the socially useful man; that is, the man whose activities tend to promote the welfare of human society as a whole.

'Now only the zealot would limit the activities of the socially useful man to the fight for social reform. Generally speaking any man who is a creator can be socially useful: the man who builds a house, for instance, or the man who writes a poem. . . . But the house may be a bleak tenement built only for profit, and the poem may be written only to glorify a brutal prince; and even though the house may furnish running water to people who lacked it, and the poem may be cherished for its loveliness by many generations after the prince is gone, yet we cannot honestly praise the social

outlook of either creator. Each man has been in reality socially useful only in spite of himself.

'It is in this spirit that the writer has approached the poets of Middle and New Comedy. Whose bread did they eat? Whose song did they sing?'

Menander belonged to the rich and leisured class himself, and sang their song; that is why he avoided all strong-flavoured criticism of the Rich and hearty laughter—his rich and leisured audience (a new description, I think, of the thousands who attended the festival of Dionysos) would have disapproved. Bad. Terence, though slave-born, had rich patrons, and was subservient to them, with the same results on his comedies. Bad again. Plautus was poor, and remained poor, and wrote for poor men; hence his rollicking fun, his caricatures of the rich, the great part played by his slaves. And that is good.

Several comments suggest themselves. First, if the poem in praise of the brutal prince lives on for its loveliness, either the poet's 'social outlook' was much wider, more humane than appeared on the surface (that is, the encomium was of little importance), or, if you prefer it, his social outlook was unimportant. Second, if what you want in comedy is a picture of the poor, of the causes and the effects of poverty, of course it is no use reading Menander; if you are interested only in the Industrial Revolution in England and its social and economic results for the masses affected by it, you will not be helped by reading Jane Austen; but there is no need for a book to prove it. Thirdly, 'Whose bread did they eat? Whose song did they sing?' This suggests an objective study, an inquiry into the *external* evidence for the lives of Menander, Plautus; and Terence and for the characters of their audiences. That would have been interesting if there were much evidence; but Mr. Dunkin makes no such attempt; virtually all his evidence is from the plays themselves, and the little 'history' which he gives us is most dubious. 'Second-century Rome was in a stage of development [social and economic] roughly

analogous to that of fourth-century Greece'; and Mr. Dunkin does not ask himself the question, which is fundamental for him, whether Plautus' audience regarded the 'life' displayed in his comedies as something foreign, Greek, not Roman at all. And Menander lived in an Athens where, thanks to the coming of the Macedonian, 'wealth was safe. The world was flooded with Persian gold; prices soared; trade multiplied. . . . The boom was on.'

Menander, as a rich man, lived comfortably in these circumstances, till the overthrow of Demetrios of Phaleron, when 'he barely escaped lynching in the popular reaction against that philosopher's radically restricted "democratic" government. Ptolemy invited him to Alexandria.' We are not even told that he refused the invitation.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

EPICURUS

A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE: *Épicure et ses Dieux*.

Pp. xv + 135. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1946. Paper, 90 fr. THIS is a small book, but it is a valuable study from a fresh and original point of view. There is here no arid discussion of the difficult problem of the atomic structure of the gods; this controversy, which has exercised so many modern commentators, is dismissed in a short parenthesis on p. 15. And the chapter which deals explicitly with the religion of Epicurus occupies only about a quarter of the book (pp. 71-101). But the importance of the work consists in an attempt to put Epicurus' religion in relation to the rest of his philosophy and still more to set it against the whole background of earlier Greek and Hellenistic religious thought. Fr. Festugière shows how the old religion was based on hope and fear—dread of what the supreme powers might do and the hope that they might be placated by worship and sacrifice. This was embodied in the civic cults of the protecting deities, but was ultimately undermined both by the break-down of the Greek city-state and by the philosophic ideas of a cosmic god. Thus arose the view that the true purpose of prayer and worship was to partake in the perfect happiness of the gods (pp. 95 ff.). It resulted in a mysticism that reached its highest expression in Stoicism, but was also adumbrated in Epicureanism. The book is therefore a strong protest against popular notions that Epicureanism had indeed a strange theology but no religion, and that Epicurus' assiduous participation in the

festivals and ceremonies was a sop to convention.

The book is focused round this central idea, but ranges with some latitude over kindred topics. The chapter on Epicurus' life throws much light on the political causes of his many changes of abode. A chapter on Epicurus and friendship serves to bring out his character and to prepare the way for his attitude to the divine, but it perhaps idealizes his theory of friendship and disguises the fact that it was based on an egocentric desire for self-preservation. Lastly there is a valuable addition on Epicurus' hostility to the astral religion, which was making headway in his time, based on the idea that the conception of the dependence of man's life on the astral bodies only reintroduced the old motives of fear and hope, which it was Epicurus' chief aim to destroy.

The rich learning and sound judgement which lie behind an apparently easily written essay are manifested not only in quotations in the text but in a succession of footnotes. In many of the latter Fr. Festugière makes interesting contributions to the text and interpretation of Epicurus and Philodemus which will have to be carefully considered by specialists. For instance, in not a few places he has convinced me that my own interpretations were wrong (see esp. p. 85, n. 4). It is perhaps rather surprising that while he calls many Greek writers as witnesses and frequently refers to Cicero's criticisms, there is hardly a mention of Lucretius. Does he suspect him as an unsafe interpreter of Epi-

curus' ideas? At least he might have quoted the striking passage in vi. 68-78 which is the most explicit expression of Epicurean mysticism.

The book is, I think, unique in that it

at once shows that Epicurus had a real and effective religion and sets this in its place in the history of Greek religious thought.

CYRIL BAILEY.

AN UNKNOWN APOLOGIST

Hartmut ERBSE: *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien herausgegeben und quellenkritisch untersucht*. Pp. vi+234. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1941. Paper.

THIS is an edition, executed with the old German thoroughness despite its recent date, of an obscure apologetic work preserved in an epitome, together with sundry late and unimportant products of the same tendency. It was a common doctrine that all that was true in Greek wisdom was derived from some sort of divine inspiration, where it was not due to borrowings from Hebrew sources. Somewhere between 474 and 501, or at latest 507/8, a Christian of some learning set out to convince, along these lines, such pagan scholars as yet remained. His work is lost, but considerable extracts, amounting to a sort of epitome of the whole, are preserved in a manuscript first published by G. Wolff in 1856, supplemented by another, the codex Tubingensis, a copy made in 1580 of an older one which perished in a fire in 1870. The relationships between these sources, the ultimate original on which they all alike depend, other late authors who excerpt the apologist, whether at first hand or otherwise, and numerous manuscripts which contain rags and scraps of the text are examined with minute attention and the conclusions which the editor draws are stated clearly. Finally comes the text itself, which fills pp. 167-201, and by way of appendix a little group of Byzantine tractates in which Greek sages (they include Thucydides, Menander, Ares, and a mysterious person called Dôn) assemble at Athens, sublimely disregarding chronology (for Plutarch meets Plato, Aristotle, and Homer face to

face), and exchange most orthodox Christian views on theology.

The apologist, whose work seems to have been entitled *Theosophia*, had read some of the more learned apologists such as Clement of Alexandria and Eusebios, a number of Sibylline oracles, and, what is rather more remarkable, Lactantius and some unknown Latin writer from whom he gets the pleasing genitive *Αἰμμόντου*—clearly his original spoke of *Haemi montis*. There is also a certain Firmianus, *οὐκ ἀθαύμαστος φιλόσοφος καὶ ἱερεὺς τοῦ προλεχθέντος Καπιτωλίου γενόμενος*, whose work, 'in the Ausonian tongue', he essays to quote (p. 188), but the excerptor left out the Latin which apparently the theosophist cited. That Lactantius and not a common Greek source is used is clear from the mistake on p. 185, where Chrysippos is credited with a treatise *περὶ θεότητος*. Lactantius (*D.I.* i. 6. 9) cites his *περὶ μαντικῆς* under the Latin title *de divinatione*, and this has misled the theosophist, whose Latin was not very accurate. On the other hand, he is to be reckoned among the few Greeks who know how to spell the name of the Capitol.

The man was the child of his time, therefore devoid of historical sense and incapable of distinguishing the genuinely ancient from the grossest forgeries. Of originality he shows no trace whatever. Nevertheless, his work, which here and there preserves scraps of learning not found elsewhere, was worth bringing out in a sound text illustrated by a detailed account of the literary ascendants and descendants of the original treatise.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

LATIN LITERATURE

- (1) Ettore BIGNONE: *Storia della letteratura latina*. Volume primo: *Originalità e formazione dello spirito romano: l'epica e il teatro dell'età della repubblica*. Seconda edizione riveduta. Pp. xii + 599. Firenze: Sansoni, 1946. Paper, L. 650.

IN an easy, discursive style, equally removed from ostentatious brilliance and from didactic pedantry, though not altogether free from repetition, Professor Bignone pursues his task with the scholarly penetration which we expect from the author of *Empedocle* (1916), *Epicuro* (1920), *Teocrito* (1934), and *Aristotele perduto* (1936). He brings to it sureness of taste and judgement, the result of a lifetime given to the study of classical antiquity and to wide reading in the literary classics of all ages. Throughout, but most strongly perhaps in the long introductory chapter on the spirit of Rome and her literature (vol. i, pp. 3-168), the reader is charmed by a characteristic of neo-Latin genius: a simple and graceful manner in which general truths are revealed, without futile endeavour to prove, and without reluctance to state, what, in the nature of things, cannot be demonstrated by tangible evidence.

It is greatly to be regretted that this excellent book will not find many readers in this country. I can think of few histories of Latin literature as stimulating, and none that I have read has seemed to me as likely to give genuine pleasure to the general reader while commanding the respectful attention of the specialist. In Italy its success has been immediate: the first edition of vol. i (1942) was sold out *con incredibile rapidità*. But what may have contributed to that success will, I fear, make a translation impracticable and thus prevent a similar success here. The author, who, from his metrical renderings of, for example, Aeschylus and Sophocles must be well known to his countrymen as a translator, freely interweaves his narrative with translations (very fine translations, as far as I can judge). Thus in Italy the book will be

enjoyed by many who do not read Latin with ease, whereas abroad in the main only specialists will consult it.

In the preface Professor Bignone states that the whole work will consist of at least four volumes. On the showing of the first two it would seem that eight is a more probable figure. Half or more of vol. ii is devoted to Lucretius, and the story comes to a close with some eighty pages on Catullus. Varro and Cicero, Sallust and Caesar loom ahead before we reach the Augustans, and vol. v may easily turn out to be a monograph on Virgil. It is only the amazing energy of Professor Bignone which makes us hope that this doubling of the proposed bulk will not delay unduly the publication of his *History of Greek Literature*, which, even more than its Latin counterpart, is to be the crowning achievement of his life's work.

The history of the earliest beginnings of Roman writing is incorporated in the introductory part of vol. i, whilst the second part deals with epic and scenic poetry in the Republican age. Chapters on individual authors are rounded off by brief appreciations of their language, style, and metre; scenic metre, however, is barely touched upon. The length of chapters is not always proportionate to their importance. Terence receives considerably more space than Plautus (though much of the bulk is due to extensive translations). In this instance Bignone refers to the lack of an exhaustive up-to-date treatment, and it is certainly worth while to expose at some length, as he does, the error of the two opposing views of Terence as a mere translator and as an original creator. It is in evaluations of this nature that the specialist will be most interested. He will gladly read of Plautus' *Aulularia* that 'Euclione non è l'arido, esoso avaro molieriano; è in fondo un buon diavolo; un "grottesco" creato per la gioia della scena, non per l'introspezione del cuore umano', and he will gladly resign to oblivion the 'figure of truly Shakespearian greatness'. But if Plautus' Euclio is 'un grottesco creato per la

gioia della scena', what was Menander's Euclio? The problem is not put with precision, although the chapter in question gives an illuminating account of the transformation to which Plautus subjects the comedy of character. A certain vagueness here and there in the face of individual problems seems to me indeed a weakness of Bignone's work, a weakness largely, I believe, due to a desire not to be too technical (cf. the absence of comment on metre mentioned above). Thus the controversial question of the origin of the Plautine *cantica* is not discussed. Bignone derives them from the dramatic *satura*. The whole problem of the dramatic *satura* will have to be considered anew in the light of B. Snell's suggestion that *satura* should be connected with Etruscan *satr-* 'to speak'. Bignone rejects, wrongly, I believe, the view that the dramatic *satura* is a mere figment of the antiquarians. But even if its existence is taken for granted the question whether the Plautine *cantica* can be derived from here should be closely examined. Bignone does not do so. Nor has he, in thirty pages devoted to Naevius, as much as a passing reference to the tantalizing quotation *Naevius in satira* (Festus, p. 257. 29 M.). In the same Naevius chapter he fails to reveal his reason for rejecting (by implication) Strzelecki's reconstruction of the *Bellum Poenicum*. And attempts at establishing a relative chronology of Plautine plays are dismissed a little too briefly with *fu tentato, ma per molti inutilmente*.

There is a very fine chapter on the Scipionic Circle (which might have mentioned Mommsen and Bernhardt as its *πρωτοὶ εὐπεραὶ*). But the magnificent picture which Bignone draws of the role played in it by Terence is—alas!—based on no evidence whatever. As minor flights of fancy I mention, *exempli gratia*, the ardent desire of third-century Rome to master a foreign literature, as attested by the translation of the *Odyssey* by a slave from Tarentum; the connexion of Ennius' *Protrepticus* with Aristotle's early work; the 'fascination of adventure and of the unknown' in Plautus' *Rudens*; and the description

of Megadorus and Eunomia in the *Aulularia* as *figure delicatamente Romane*; the last, rather exceptionally, a flight right into the face of probability.

The volume is concluded by bibliographies relating to chapters. They are on the whole compiled with discretion, but some insignificant work is quoted and important work left out. Plautine prosody should begin with Mueller's *Plautinische Prosodie*, and Marx's *Rudens*, for all its wrong-headedness, is indispensable; Merula's Ennius (*Annals*) deserves a place no less than Columna's. Misprints, not infrequent in the work as a whole, rather obtrude themselves here. An alphabetical index is to follow in vol. iii.

O. SKUTSCH.

University of Manchester.

- (2) Ettore BIGNONE: *Storia della letteratura latina*. Vol. II. *La prosa romana sino all'età di Cesare, Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo*. Pp. 470. Firenze: Sansoni, 1945. Paper, L. 450.

PROFESSOR BIGNONE has been very active during the war years. A translation of the plays of Aeschylus appeared in 1939, followed in 1942 by *Il libro della letteratura greca*, and since then he has turned his attention to Latin. The first volume of a full-dress history of Latin literature was issued in 1942 (re-published in 1946), and 1945-6 saw the publication of *Il libro della letteratura latina* and the second volume of the *Storia*, which covers the early prose-writers together with Lucilius, Lucretius, and Catullus. This volume is undoubtedly a valuable contribution to the history of the period, and contains much that will need the attention of scholars. Its tone is laudatory and often enthusiastic, especially in the chapters dealing with Lucretius and Catullus. The writings of each author are put in close connexion with the social and political developments of the period, the life of each is told as fully as our information permits and his work reviewed in detail; through it all run the main threads of his thought and characteristics. The text is illustrated by copious translations, which, as far as a foreigner

can judge, are vivid and faithful without too slavish an adherence to the original. The study of Lucilius (c. 5, pp. 77-113) is an excellent example of the way in which a coherent picture can be made of a poet who exists for us only in fragments, and there are frequent *obiter dicta* which will remain in a reader's mind: 'not less than the Gracchi, he felt the breath of the new democracy' (p. 84), 'his satire is not the ill-natured diversion of a bitter reactionary mind, but an outward expression (*espansione*) of his heart' (p. 88), 'his is the poetry of the simple and healthy life' (p. 100)—it might be questioned whether Lucilius was not rather more sophisticated than that—, 'the philosophy of Lucilius is Roman good sense applied to everyday life' (p. 103), 'he is a genial dilettante rather than a consummate artist'. The merit of the chapter on Catullus (c. 9, pp. 343-426) is that Bignone refuses to accept the common view of his 'double personality', the spontaneous lover and hater on the one hand, and on the other the artificial imitator of the Hellenistic poets. He regards him always as one; the spirit of freshness and youth, which was his inspiration in the lyrics and elegies, made him open his heart to the beauties of the new Greek style, and even when he is most imbued with the Alexandrian artistry, a Roman touch or a personal experience, as Bignone argues again and again, converts imitation into originality. This unification is not perhaps quite convincing and still leaves the sense of a gulf between the *Passer* and the *Peleus and Thetis*.

The most important section of the book is undoubtedly that on Lucretius (cc. 6-8, pp. 114-342), for here Bignone, who has done so much for the interpretation of Epicurus, speaks with special authority. The first of these three chapters sets Lucretius against the background of the crisis of his day, political, religious, and intellectual, and in relation to the movements of scepticism and superstition. The second is devoted to Lucretius himself, his life and his mind; it brings out clearly his relation to Epicurus, to Empedocles, and to the

Alexandrians, and emphasizes his essential Roman independence. Chapter 8 is a full and careful analysis of the whole poem with copious quotations in translation and many valuable footnotes on the text. To students of Lucretius the most interesting contribution is the appendix on the proem to Venus in Book I (pp. 427-43) in which Bignone, fully accepting the identification of Venus with the Epicurean *voluptas* (*ἡδονή*) argues that she represents both the 'kinematic' and the 'catastematic' pleasure. In the first 23 lines Venus is the 'kinematic' pleasure of the sexual relation which is the cause of creation; this has always been recognized and is vouched for by the *Ἀφροδίτη-ἡδονή* of Greek thought and the Venus Physica of the Romans. In the second part, the picture of Venus and Mars, Bignone would see the personification of the 'catastematic' pleasure, the *ἀραπαξία* of Epicurus, which results in the *pax* which characterizes the life of the gods (he restores lines 44-9), and is the gift for which he prays for himself and Memmius and Rome. This is a new idea which would knit together the whole proem, but it has its difficulties: there is no other trace of a personification of the goddess as 'catastematic' pleasure; it does not seem quite natural; and it makes the proem more cryptic and esoteric than ever.

A word may be said here of *Il libro della letteratura latina* (Firenze, Le Monnier, 1946; L. 450), which is designed as a companion to *The Book of Greek Literature*. In 573 pages it traces the whole history of Latin literature from the earliest beginnings to the early Christian writers up to St. Jerome. It appears to be an abridgement of the five volumes of the *Storia*, and in that part where comparison is possible uses the same translations and often repeats verbatim the same paragraphs of comment. It is not easy to see its purpose; a short history of two or three hundred pages might have been useful for non-Latin readers, but the book as it stands is too long for that purpose and strikes one as an almost unnecessary reduplication.

C. BAILEY.

THE BUDÉ *SILVAE*

STACE: *Silves*. Texte établi par Henri Frère et traduit par H. J. Izaac. Tome I (livres i-iii). Pp. liii+129, avec notes complémentaires. Tome II (livres iv-v). Pp. 135-210, avec notes complémentaires. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944. Paper.

THIS translation of the *Silvae* was left unpublished by M. H. J. Izaac at his death in 1938. To it M. Frère has added a text and apparatus criticus, which, except in a few points, reproduces the critical edition published by him in 1943. He has revised the whole work, and added a considerable body of annotations.

The Introduction is divided into two sections, 'Stace et les *Silves*' (pp. i-xxxiv) and 'Le Texte des *Silves*' (pp. xxxv-liii). The first portion is a clear and workmanlike account of the poet's life and literary activity, embodying full references to appropriate passages in the *Silvae*. It includes a chronological table of the poems, showing their relation to contemporary history and to poems by Martial upon similar themes. F. brings out here three good points: (i) that v. iii. 141 ff. provides insufficient evidence for supposing that Statius' father won prizes at Greek festivals; (ii) that the term *Silvae* is not connected with ὕλη, and is 'ni un genre, ni une espèce littéraire, mais un titre' (this point is dealt with more fully on pp. xxxii ff., with full quotation of relevant passages); (iii) that S.'s debt to the rhetorical schools has been exaggerated. He claims that the *Silvae*, including as they do many references to everyday life, and having their origin in improvisation, contain, as might be expected, many rhetorical passages, but are not fully worked out as *progymnasmata*—'les *Silves* sont un beau cas de syncrétisme littéraire': the *ρόποι*, and in some cases, the order of the *ρόποι*, are all that Statius owes to rhetoric. This view reappears in the notes to i. i. 2, ii. i. 148, iii. 59, vi. i. 1; II. i. i. 1, ii. 72; III. i. 2, ii. 1; IV. i. 1; and v. iv. 1. In these, however, he appears at times dogmatic (e.g. on i. ii. 148 and vi. i).

In the second portion F. summarizes with clarity the manuscript tradition. Here he rejects in part the *stemma* of Klotz and Phillimore, concluding that the Matritensis is the only true authority for the text, and that its readings should be retained wherever possible. While agreeing with his assertion that to many *cruces* a solution can be found only if a new manuscript of sufficient antiquity is discovered, I must take him to task on his opinion that the *Silvae* is not good material for emendation. It is probable that this belief, and his excessively conservative attitude to M., are both due to a certain hesitancy in F.'s own critical faculty which may be observed in many places: e.g. in i. vi. 64 he reads *pugiles*, rejecting *pūmīlos* on metrical grounds (crit. note), but in his annotation is inclined to think that *pūmīlos* may after all stand (he also accepts *Plīadum* in i. iii. 95). On II. iii. 17 he finds it hard to ascertain exactly what the difficulty in *niueae* is; and he accepts without doubt *iugali* (I. ii. 183), *terent* (II. ii. 124), *quinta . . . ora* (II. vi. 79: 'pour la cinquième fois, Phosphoros au bord du monde'), *longo nepoti* (III. iii. 78: 'la longue suite de ses descendants'), *litus* (III. v. 93: Baehrens's *lusus* is not mentioned in the app. crit., being included, presumably, in *alii aliter*), *tarde* (IV. iv. 66: 'qui ont de la peine à entrer . . .'), *colunt* (IV. ix. 13: 'préservent les anchois de Byzance'), and—perhaps worst of all—*papillas* (V. v. 17: 'qui ont . . . frappé . . . leur poitrine et éteint un sein enflammé par le lait').

Two of his conjectures (of which there are few) must be condemned outright—*bellus in casside* (II. vi. 42), which is unmetrical and gives the wrong sense, as *Theb.* ix. 699 ff., quoted in his note, shows; and *bafis* (III. ii. 140) (for *bafis*, assumed as a correction for *bafis*)—a form which is in no wise proved by his note.

A similar tendency to disregard evidence, even when it is obvious, is shown by his interpretation of i. iii. 63 (where he reads *demet* with M): he translates: 'et peut-être . . . quelque Naiade . . . ou

quelque Hamadryade te retranchera-t-elle une vie qui n'a pas été interrompue'. His note is 'L'arbre ne mourra que de la mort de la Naiade ou de l'Hamadryade qui l'habite', but his quoted parallels (Ovid, *Met.* viii. 770 ff., *Hymn. Aphr.* 268, Callim. *Hymn.* iv. 81) state the converse.

Some few difficulties are patched rather inexpertly, notably II. i. 64, v. i. 19 and 39; and the punctuation is sometimes questionable, as in III. i. 1-5.

The text, then, as it follows M closely, does not advance in any way that of Klotz or that of Phillimore, though in some respects it is easier to use. The apparatus criticus is full as far as manuscript readings are concerned, but too little space is given to conjectures. F. too often is content with silence, or with notes such as *alii alia (nihil certi)*, while those conjectures which he does print are at times chosen with insufficient discernment.

The translation is smooth, readable, and on the whole accurate. At times it is rather free, glossing over difficulties tactfully; frequently it is felicitous. Some faults may be mentioned: the rendering of II. i. 130 makes little sense; in II. vi. 40 *toruoque* [sic] *uirilis gratia* is—reasonably—rendered 'mais tu étais fier et ta prestance était virile', but at v. iii. 63 *toruo Maroni* becomes 'le farouche Virgile'. If the epithet can be justified,

most assuredly this is not its meaning. Nuances are missed in I. ii. 29, where *ille solutus amor* is 'that passion which was once so free', not 'cet amour sans frein'; and *ille canorus* (II. iv. 9) is not fully expressed by 'ô voix harmonieuse'. II. vi. 102 (*obliquo notat Proserpina multu*) is given as 'Proserpine note-t-elle d'un regard oblique sa présence', which is explained by 'elle envie les Naiades'. Not necessarily—unobtrusive surveillance may be implied.

The notes abound in erudition, but, as I have mentioned above, at times conclusion is at variance with evidence. Had they been more thoroughly digested, they would have been even more useful than they are.

But the detailing of these faults does not mean that we have not here a real contribution to the study of Statius. In spite of the author's modest disclaimer, the notes are very much of a commentary—although one misses remarks on S.'s language and style—and the reader will find himself compelled to treat them as such. In spite of the defects of judgement to which I have alluded, there are frequent flashes of imagination and common sense. M. Frère deserves the best thanks of latinists for this work, published amid conditions of grievous warfare.

W. R. SMYTH.

University College, Swansea.

TERTULLIAN DE PALLIO

Alois GERLO: Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus *De Pallio*. Kritische Uitgave met Vertaling en Commentaar. 2 vols. Pp. x + 108; 226. Wetteren: De Meester, 1940. Paper.

THE *De Pallio* is the quaintest, alike in conception and in execution, of all the works of Tertullian that have come down to us. His interest in clothes recalls that of another rugged personality not unlike his own, that of Thomas Carlyle. The book has been several times published by itself, most recently by Marra (1932 and 1937), but both from the point of view of text and from that of interpretation something more ambitious was desirable, and this Dr. Gerlo, not with-

out success, has endeavoured to supply in an edition of great external beauty. The circumstances of the time readily explain why it has appeared in Dutch, rather than French or German, though these languages, as the author must know, still make a wider appeal.

The introduction discusses the tradition, manuscript and printed. The manuscripts, as was fairly well known, all belong to the fifteenth century and are thirteen in number. The Hirschau and Gorze manuscripts, known to Beatus Rhenanus in the early part of the sixteenth century, have almost certainly perished, very regrettably, as there is little doubt that they were older than

the Italian group now surviving, and were probably their ancestors. It is unfortunate that the Luxembourg MS. was not collated by Dr. Gerlo, so that we might judge for ourselves what its real character is: it was unknown to Kroymann, the future Vienna editor.

Dr. Gerlo gives an account of the published commentaries down to those of Marra and of translations into modern languages. Then follows a summary of the views that have been expressed on the character and purpose of the treatise, its sources, date, style, and vocabulary. These last-mentioned parts include a description of the *clausulae*, and a list of ἀναξ εἰρημένα, words first used by Tertullian, words with an unusual sense, transitive verbs used as intransitive or reflexive, rare words, and archaisms. After the text with critical apparatus and the translation on the right-hand pages, the first volume ends with an index of proper names and a table of contents.

The second volume contains a bibliography, the detailed commentary, and the index of matters, words, and phrases explained in the commentary. It is but bare justice to state that the commentary is the best that has been produced alike for subject-matter and for language. It would have been better still if the author had made use of works published on this side of the Channel; but for all Dr. Gerlo cares, Mayor, Housman, and Lindsay might never have lived at all. His attitude is like that of the Germans down to about 1880, and the reader ought perhaps to

be reminded that the preface is dated March 1940.

The 1550 edition is described with insufficient accuracy on p. 11, n. 4, and for 'Carthaginensis' read 'Carthaginensis presbyteri'; so on p. 14, n. 4, l. 5, 'Liber' has been omitted before 'De Pallio'; on p. 18, the reprint of Semler, 1827-25, is unmentioned: few can attain to the exactness of F. Madan and P. S. Allen in these matters. 1. 1 read *Carthaginenses*; 1. 2 *deus* for *deux*; 2. 3 *fluitasse* for *fuitasse*; vol. ii, p. 6, the employment of C. O. Müller's 1839 edition of Festus is as astonishing as it is regrettable; p. 16 and often, the Greek printing is defective; pp. 18, 215 *epexegeticus* for *epexegeticus*; p. 31, the Isidore quotation should read *est autem pallium purum forma rotunda et fusiore et quasi inundante sinu... supra*; L. R. Taylor on the Roman toga is omitted; p. 36, *Poenicum* is the old Latin form, whether you call it a grecism or not; p. 96, *Romanitas* is formed on the analogy of *Latinitas*; p. 114, for *nubetur* read *nubatur*; p. 117, for *clacularius* read *clancularius*; p. 128, the latest edition of Festus (Paris, 1930, p. 399) varies seriously; p. 133, l. 3, read *Sardanapalli*; p. 162, for *uestutate* read *uetustate* and give the Dessau reference, 3805; p. 165, in the Festus passage omit *argenteum* and read *uehantur* for *uehebantur*; p. 166, add a reference to Engelbrecht's classic article on *suggestus* (*Wiener Studien* 1906, p. 157); p. 170, correct *finibriarum* to *fimbriarum*; in the index *saecularis*, *selgicae*, *sortes*, and *stationes* are misplaced. A. SOUTER.

Oxford.

JEW AND CHRISTIAN IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

Bernhard BLUMENKRANZ: *Die Judenpredigt Augustins*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten Jahrhunderten. Pp. xvi+218. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1946. Paper, 10 Sw. fr.

THE latest addition (Band 25) to the valuable series of 'Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft' places at the disposal of students a useful and elabo-

ately annotated survey of the attitude towards the Jews not only of St. Augustine but in a very large number of other writings of earlier date from Tertullian downwards. That some of the latter are anonymous and others certainly pseudonymous should not deprive them of a right to a place beside the seventy-three works of Augustine and at least an equal number of the books of other patristic writers of unimpeached

genuineness, since their date can usually, at least approximately, be fixed, and they combine as elements in a reasonably complete, if somewhat variegated, picture. It is now more than half a century since M. Friedländer wrote on 'Die Kirchengväter als Verteidiger des Judentums', but there is another side to which allusion is made in Professor Burkitt's article on 'The Debt of Christianity to Judaism' in the *Legacy of Israel* (Clarendon Press, 1927). And if treatises to which the title *Adversus Iudaeos* could be strictly applied, whether from the hand of Tertullian, Ps.-Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, or another, and 'Altercationes', whether between Simon the Jew and Theophilus the Christian or between the Church and the Synagogue, tend to become less frequent, the figure of Averroes lying prostrate beneath the feet of St. Thomas in the famous altar-piece at Pisa represents something more than the issue of a supposed contest in dialectic. The most celebrated of St. Augustine's utterances on the subject—the book or sermon called 'Tractatus adversus Iudaeos'—is given complete by Dr. Blumenkranz in a German translation (pp. 89–110). In a sense it is controversial, as might be expected, but it is intended to be persuasive, not objurgatory, and its eirenic tone is in marked contrast with the frigidity and even hostility of some other writers. St. Augustine would have Christians preach to the Jews in a spirit of love; mindful, as he says in one of

his Epiphany sermons, 'quoniam potens Deus est iterum inserere eos, habeamus infatigabilem caritatem'. The argument in the translated treatise is subjected to an analysis and examination which occupy a third of the book and are illustrated by copious parallels. The fact that some of the Augustinian arguments may seem bizarre and even occasionally absurd to the modern reader will not necessarily deprive them of interest for the student of the period. Points arising in the course of the discussions such as the use of the terms 'Hebrews, Israelites, Jews' or 'Jews, Pagans, Heretics' and the like are dealt with in excursuses, and a more elaborate treatment is added of the treatise as a whole with discussions of its genuineness, date, character as 'Predigt oder Buch', and the purpose with which it was composed. Nor should mention be omitted of the comparison and contrast between the Jewish question as it presented itself to St. Ambrose and to St. Augustine, and again, from another and rather different angle, to the eyes of St. Jerome; or of the brief section on the *Apotheosis* of Prudentius which claims for it an unusual title to consideration. The author acknowledges his obligations to the 'Fonds Européen de Secours aux Étudiants' which made his two years at Basle possible: it is certainly an expenditure which gives everyone ground for satisfaction.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

DATED GREEK MINUSCULE MSS.

Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the year 1200 A.D. Edited by Kirsopp LAKE and Silva LAKE. Fasc. X: *MSS. at Florence, Athens, Grottaferrata and the Meteora*. 18 pp., 7 pp. of ruling types; Nos. 363–401, pls. 674–757. Boston, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1939. 42s. net. Indexes to Fascs. I to X. Pp. xxxv + 185. 8vo. Boston, 1945.

FOR earlier notices see *C.R.* xlix (1935) 180, l (1936) 80, li (1937) 35, liii (1939) 135. In 1939 the authors had been ex-

cavating at Van, yet they brought out this Fascicule X in that year: they had at first hoped that it would complete their task, but there still remained another 150 dated manuscripts of which they knew, and the war made it impossible to deal with these. So they decided to provide full indexes to Fasc. I–X and leave the remaining manuscripts to the future. One partner will not be able to share the labour, as Kirsopp Lake died in November 1946 after a life which gave the most varied contributions to learning, some unlimited

in their implications, others, as in this work, matters of exceeding accuracy joined with wide knowledge.

This Fascicule X gives us twelve manuscripts in the Laurentian Library, three that have come to light in Athens, two in the Meteora; the remaining twenty-two are at Grottaferrata.

Only two can be counted anything like classical: no. 363 (pls. 674-5), Laur. xxviii. 26, is an uncial of Theon of Alexandria (father of Hypatia), on the *Canons* of Ptolemy. The first scribe takes the list of emperors (dated by the Seleucid era) down to Leo VI (886-911); three additions in minuscule can be precisely assigned to the reigns of Constantine Monomachus (1042-54), Alexis Comnenus (1081-1118), and Constantine the Last (c. 1453). Someone in A.D. 1314 noted that this date was 1,638 years after the accession of Philip Arrhidaeus, 1,243 after that of Augustus, and 1,030 after that of Diocletian—superfluity of chronology, but this sort of thing was the raw material of Scaliger and his helpers. I might have put the uncial earlier than 886, but should have corrected myself by the elaborate headings. The other classic is no. 368 (pl. 689), Laur. lxxix. 9, Plutarch, *Lives*, Bk. III; two or three leaves at beginning and end have been supplied in a later hand, which has noted on the last leaf that the manuscript except these leaves was written in 997: their writing agrees perfectly (cf. Cavalieri-Lietzmann, no. 18, dated 992).

The three manuscripts at Athens are not of much interest, nor those at Meteora, where our authors faced a great disappointment, as the Abbot of the Transfiguration could not find a manuscript dated 862, the second oldest known (see K. Weitzmann, *Die Byz. Buchmalerei*, p. 39, and N. A. Bees in *Rev. des Ét. Gr.* xxvi, 1913, 13-74).

Kirsopp Lake had studied the Greek monasteries in south Italy and Sicily as early as 1903 and 1904, so with the only survivor, Grottaferrata (near Tusculum; it claims to be on the site of Cicero's villa), he was on familiar ground, but many of its own manuscripts are in the Vatican. Their style seems to me the

only one that can be readily recognized (see Index, p. xix), though the 'Studium' has claims to particular manners of writing. The south Italian manuscripts seem to make up a surprisingly large proportion of dated Greek manuscripts, perhaps a third, but it is not among them that we can look for classics.

The Index volume is to me of great interest, and contains no less than fourteen indexes: manuscripts in order as published, libraries, chronological order, subjects, rulers, scribes, other persons mentioned, monasteries, etc., cities, types of ruling, prices, manuscripts of known locality, ornament, and dated manuscripts which the authors had not yet reached. The Introduction gives something about the libraries, help with chronology and the distribution of manuscripts in time, with special hands, with the types of ruling from which the authors have extracted some assistance in dating and placing manuscripts. (In the summary of these results on p. xxv each roman-figure reference to previous pages should be increased by two.) Up to 175 types are figured; most only occur once or twice, only 13 occur more than 5 times, but these 13 include 142 manuscripts.

The relation of the writing to the ruling is more interesting: it may be upon the line, or pendent from it, or else what I call indeterminate, i.e. across the line, or disregarding it, or sometimes on and sometimes under, or finally without any line. The result is:

IX c. 9 MSS.: on, 4; indeterminate, 4; pendent, 1.
901-24. 9 MSS.: on, 4; indeterminate, 3; pendent, 2.
927-48. 8 MSS.: on, 3; indeterminate, 0; pendent, 5.
953-75. 28 MSS.: on, 6; indeterminate, 9; pendent, 13.
976-99. 29 MSS.: on, 2; indeterminate, 5; pendent, 22.
1001-25. 33 MSS.: on, 2; indeterminate, 11; pendent, 20.

After which hardly any writing comes on the line: but the transition takes longer than used to be supposed.

The analysis of ornamentation deserves careful study: it helps with dating and with drawing the distinction between Eastern and south Italian manu-

scripts. Here we may say that no colour at all is an early sign, e.g. the books of Arethas, and almost all classics are very severe. Carmine is mostly Eastern, vermilion Italian, less distinctively in later times; yellow or other colour wash is Italian. Decoration in full miniature style (like mosaic ornament) with polychromy comes from Constantinople or Athos, begins about 943, and is rare after 1150: the boldness of simple patterns in black or red is quite attractive. Queer figures of men and animals are mostly Italian. Only about one manuscript in forty has scenes or portraits, these mostly evangelists or other authors: only about fifteen manuscripts have less stereotyped compositions.

Of the 150 manuscripts undealt with the authors say the list 'seems more formidable than it really is'. One or two libraries have been destroyed by fire or Bulgarian invasion and so are hopeless. The chief gaps are Sinai (now closed to photographers, but P. Uspenskiy stole many specimens now in Leningrad) and the Escorial; also some manuscripts were missed at Moscow and Leningrad: Pal. Soc., Graux et Martin, Cereteli-Sobolevski are a help. I do not expect there are any classics.

After the Introduction come 'Notes', fresh information that has turned up

since the various fascicules were published. On no. 32 I would suggest that the name Samonas which bothers the authors is written in just such Latin letters as one finds on Byzantine coins. Many notes deal with unfriendly remarks made by Dr. Dölger on Fascs. VII and VIII in *Zeit. f. Byz. Lit.* 1940, accepting some and refuting others. At the end of everything are three pages of Errata. I am ashamed to find how few of them I had noticed.

To sum up, in the 401 manuscripts there seem to be only twelve that can be anyway called classics, some our friends, two Aristotles, Euclid, Homer, Isocrates, Lucian, Plato, and Plutarch, the others rather less familiar, Alcinous, Nomocanon, Nonnus, Porphyry, Theon. In my first notice on Fascs. I and II I was sorry to find only seven (all in II), but these seven were half of the whole. Another sorrow was that since E. D. Clarke, afterwards to be our University Librarian, sold his Plato to Bodley, we had no dated Greek manuscript in Cambridge. But this very month this sorrow has been wiped away by A. N. L. Munby, the new Librarian of King's College, who has bought an unknown *Evangelistarion* dated 1052.

ELLIS H. MINNS.

Pembroke College, Cambridge.

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY LITERARY CRITICISM

MARVIN T. HERRICK: *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555*. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. xxxii, No. i.) Pp. 117. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Paper, \$1.50.

THE main principles of the neo-classic critical code were obtained directly or deduced ingeniously from classical authorities, especially Aristotle and Horace, with Plato, Cicero, and others as subsidiary contributors, by Italian humanists in the sixteenth century. While Mr. Harding does not deny that Minturno (1559 and 1563), Scaliger (1561), and Castelvetro (1570), to whom ought to be added Vida (1527), were the chief exporters of neo-classic dogma to England through the intermediation of Sidney,

his concern is not with these critical theorists, but with certain commentators mostly between 1531 and 1555. His aim is to distinguish 'the various parallels and connections that the commentators found between the epistle of Horace [*De Arte Poetica*] and the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle', and to prove that it was rather Aristotle who was brought to illustrate Horace than Horace to dot Aristotle's *i*'s and cross his *i*'s. 'Nearly all the critical precepts', he says, 'that are familiar to students of literary criticism of the late sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries are to be found in these Horatian commentaries published before 1555.'

In view of Mr. Herrick's closely mar-

shall evidence, that cannot be denied. But it does not follow that these commentators were such originators as Mr. Harding implies or that Aristotle played second fiddle to Horace in the neo-classic prelude. The *Poetics* was as familiarly known as the *Ars Poetica*, even if it was later in being translated into Italian, and was the subject of public lectures.

Mr. Herrick knows his Horatian and Aristotelian commentators thoroughly. But there are signs of gaps and omissions beyond his chosen field. For example, nothing is said of the *Pro Archia* as a document in the justification of poetry. More serious is the omission of all mention of Politian, whose *Manto* and other critical poems were written as early as the fourteen-eighties or even earlier; and of Trissino whose *Poetica* appeared in 1529. The only references to Daniello, who published his *Poetica* in 1536, are in two footnotes of no importance. And Vida is mentioned twice, once merely as a name and the second time with the remark, in connexion with the hierarchical arrangement of epic above tragedy, that 'Perhaps Vida is here influential, but I have never found any specific evidence of his influence in the commentaries'. The fact is, however, as Saintsbury says, that Vida's *Poetica* (1527) not only had an influence for at least 200 years possibly greater even than that of Horace or Aristotle, but anticipated almost the whole critical

orthodoxy of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.

As for Mr. Herrick's references to English neo-classic criticism, they are rather sketchy. For one thing he ignores completely the different tones imparted to English criticism, first by such Dutch or German humanists as Heinsius, Pontanus, and Vossius, and secondly by the French neo-classicism of Boileau, Rapin, Bossu, and Dacier, to say nothing of earlier French influence from *La Pléiade*. It is unfortunate also that in discussing the dramatic rules in English criticism Mr. Harding, in the face of the whole of the popular Elizabethan drama, except Ben Jonson's and a few other equally untypical pieces, should commit himself to the statement that 'after the middle of the sixteenth century the rules were never wholly ignored in England, even by Shakespeare, though at times he flouted them'. Again it is a complete misrepresentation of Dryden to label him one of the 'leading neo-classical critics in England before 1700', whereas in fact Dryden was most himself when he rebelled, as he did again and again, both in theory and in practice, against neo-classic decorum. And why is there no mention of Dr. Johnson's delivering the *coup de grâce* to the rules in *The Rambler*, no. 156, and then dancing on the grave thereof in his *Preface to Shakespeare*?

A. M. CLARK.

University of Edinburgh.

CICERO: THE LAST PHASE

Hartvig FRISCH: *Cicero's Fight for the Republic*. The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics. (Humanitas, I.) Pp. 311; 9 plates, map. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1946. Paper, kr. 25. THIS is the first of a series of English translations of Danish classical studies which is being published with the help of subsidies from the Rask-Ørsted Foundation—a most welcome sign of the desire of our Scandinavian colleagues to renew and extend the fellowship of humane letters between themselves and us. Its format, printing, and plates are admirably elegant and clear.

Professor Frisch exemplifies the combination—of which Theodor Mommsen a century ago is the most striking instance—of ancient historian and militant modern politician. The German occupation of Denmark forced him out of his leadership of the Social Democratic Group in the Riksdag, but happily did not prevent his election to the Chair of Classical Philology at Copenhagen, where the original of this volume was published in 1942. An English version is promised, in the same 'Humanitas' series, of a larger work of his now in progress, on *Might and Right in Anti-*

quity—a title which sufficiently indicates the angle of his approach to problems of the ancient world. Each of his two activities enriches and vitalizes the other.

This book, indeed, is not 'ideological' propaganda, but a work of solid and objective scholarship, founded upon a close examination of the *Philippics* in the revealing side-lights cast by the *Letters*, with full consideration of the modern literature from Mommsen onwards—though one may be allowed to regret the lack of reference to a classic of one's undergraduate days, Strachan-Davidson's *Cicero* in the 'Heroes of the Nations', and among newer works—probably not yet accessible to the author—the American Haskell's *This was Cicero*. But Adcock in *C.A.H.* ix and Syme's *The Roman Revolution* are cited with appreciation, as well as the latest edition of Gelzer's *Caesar der Politiker und Staatsmann*.

One general stricture must be reluctantly offered. The book has been translated by a compatriot of the author, and the translation has been read and commented on by Father C. C. Martindale, who 'combines a scholar's knowledge with a poet's sense of language'. But it is evident that his criticism has been either perfunctory or much too lenient. The translation is not good and is often decidedly bad: not, indeed, so bad as to conceal the meaning altogether, but constantly impeding and irritating—sometimes by using the wrong English word for a political idea (such as 'sovereignty' on p. 37, to express the arrogant assumption of superior rights by the Roman *nobiles*), or by awkward inversions of phrase (as when Caesar's judiciary laws are 'conservatively marked', where 'markedly conservative' is meant), more often by the use of colloquialisms out of place and out of key, and in general by giving the impression of trying, and failing, to be knowingly idiomatic when a literal version would be at once plainer and less disconcerting. The proof-reading has not been perfect—which is easily pardonable in the present conditions of printing here, and doubtless in Denmark also. But some mistakes (such as *municipii* as a nominative

plural, pp. 19 and 189, or an obvious mistranslation on p. 17 of a phrase in Polybius vi. 17) can hardly be dismissed as mere misprints. One cannot but be sorry that matter of such quality has not been better rendered: it is to be hoped that later volumes of the series will be more competently checked in translation.

Nos cum Antonio bellum gerimus, non pari condicione, contra arma verbis . . . spes tamen una est aliquando populum Romanum maiorum similem fore. Cicero's own words (to Cornificius in *Fam.* xii. 22, written in September 44, soon after he had thrown down the gauntlet in the First Philippic and when he was probably already at the writing of the Second) aptly and pathetically state the situation whose development is traced in elaborate detail by Professor Frisch; and one might quote also—though out of their context—other words of his which are ironically self-revealing: *verba tantum adfero, quibus abundo*. But the question is, whether the fight was really necessary: whether Cicero's inveterate habit of identifying his own personal piques and enmities with the just quarrels and real dangers of the Republic did not drive him to wreck the *fundamenta pacis* which he claims credit for laying—the 'amnesty' decreed in the Temple of Tellus two days after the Ides of March. To answer this, it is not at all necessary to accept Mommsen's estimate of the 'short-sighted egotist', 'valiant in opposition to sham attacks', the 'journalist in the worst sense of the term', 'nothing but an advocate and not a good one', any more than to accept Cicero's own portrait of Antony. But while both of them can be seen, at this distance, to have been in the wrong, and neither of them can justly be condemned for failing to solve a situation which, as Matius said, would have baffled Caesar himself, it may be that an equal, even the larger, share of blame should lie with Cicero for his blind hatred of Antony and his readiness to connive at, even to insist upon and attempt to justify, gross breaches of the constitution which he claimed to be upholding.

Such, at any rate, is the general effect of Professor Frisch's presentation of the evidence, though for the most part he refrains from explicit judgements. The analysis is done with great care and completeness, especially in the matter of chronological sequence and in the accounts of the senatorial debates, where the frequent shifts of balance show how insecure and indeed how unreal was Cicero's position as 'leader of the republican party'. Gradually, and

not without skill, the narrative reveals the emergence of the real master of the situation, neither Cicero nor Antony but 'the boy' Octavianus. For a relief from the tangle of political wires, the battle of Forum Gallorum, which furnished the occasion for the last Philippic, is vividly narrated from the letter of Servius Galba (*Fam.* x. 30) written on the next day.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

THE EARLY CHURCH

Walter Woodburn HYDE: *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*. Pp. viii+296. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth, 22s. net.

THE seven chapters of Professor Hyde's book, with introduction and epilogue, three excursuses, and a full index of nearly twenty-four pages, supply a comprehensive study of a difficult theme with very numerous footnotes giving references to authorities cited and to further discussions of individual problems by other writers in later days. To some readers besides professional students of comparative religion the discussion of 'the Native Religion of the Romans' and 'Mystery-Religions and Kindred Philosophies' may seem rather more cursory than might have been expected and even at times to yield a little too readily to the attraction of superficial similarities. But the historical summaries will be found interesting as well as informative even by those who may hesitate as to the full justification of the inferences drawn from them, and the same may be said also perhaps of some of the literary judgements delivered *obiter*, such as one in regard to Lucretius that 'His *De rerum natura* has its nearest counterpart in *Paradise Lost* whose author was more akin to him than to any other poet because of his moral earnestness and sense of the beauty of nature'. And some further commentary may seem to be needed on the dictum that 'Neo-Platonic ethics reached their height in Julian's attempt

to restore "Hellenism", and again at Alexandria in the persons of the mathematician-astronomer Theon and his more famous daughter Hypatia'. A section of thirty-two pages on 'Judaism and the Old Testament' which follows deals in passing with a great variety of other topics and loses in consequence in one direction if it gains something in interest in another. For Professor Hyde 'the Old Testament is a veritable arsenal of texts bristling with the cruelties of war'—which is hardly the dominant aspect of it in the minds of most readers and needs, indeed, the same kind of qualification as the reference to 'the Jew regarding his God as unique' or the allusion in a later section to 'Mary's deification'.

The last four chapters deal specifically with Christianity, its progress and triumph, two of the sections being devoted to 'The Personality of Jesus' (pp. 109-45) and 'The Teaching of Jesus' (pp. 146-63). The author, we are told in the Introduction, has attempted to treat the subject 'in the spirit of critical historical scholarship of our time, which investigates the beginnings of Christianity as fearlessly as it would those of Mithraism or any other religion once powerful in antiquity'. To this procedure no objection can be taken provided that the canons of such criticism are generally recognized and consistently followed and are unprejudiced by illegitimate assumptions such as seem to underlie the findings of some of the critics whom the author himself somewhat devastatingly criticizes. 'Historic

Doubts' have in the past afforded a theme for satire, and it is permissible to wonder if anyone would be satisfied if the same criteria were applied to the tradition of classical literature as have been used in regard to the New Testament writings. In the present work we are led to suppose that 'while Paul . . . is the best known figure from Christian antiquity due to the self-revelation of his Letters and the account of his missionary journeys and trial in the Acts, Jesus is one of the least known. Of his life, beyond his birth in Nazareth, the fact that he had brothers and sisters,

that he followed his father's trade of joinery, and finally that he turned preacher and was slain in Jerusalem, we know almost nothing.' But there are passages which suggest that the author is not wholly satisfied with the result. The three appendixes deal with the 'Origin of Christmas', 'Sunday Observance', and the question 'Was St. Peter in Rome?' without mention of the work of Lietzmann. Apart from a rather large number of misprints the work is beautifully produced.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN IN THE FOURTH CENTURY A.D.

H. MULLER: *Christians and Pagans from Constantine to Augustine*. Part I: *The Religious Policies of the Roman Emperors*. Pp. iii+155. Pretoria: Union Booksellers, 1946. Paper, 14s. net.

A REVIEWER of Dr. Muller's book is faced by a difficulty: it has been written in Pretoria without access to a large library. Thus it would be unfair to complain that the writer has not mentioned Professor Grégoire's challenge to the *Vita Constantini* of Eusebius; that challenge has already secured, at least in principle, the adherence of, for example, Zeiller, Seston, and Lambrechts. But if indeed the *Vita Constantini* is in 'vastes parties' a falsification by an 'arianisant' writing in the fifth century, it is obvious that the portrayal of Constantine's religious policy will not be unaffected. A reviewer may regret that Dr. Muller could not consult, to take a single instance, Joseph Vogt's remarkable study *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum* (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1939): his discussion of Julian's attitude towards the Jews would have been more satisfying. But Dr. Muller's book must be judged by reference to its place of composition.

The story of the relations of the fourth-century emperors towards Christianity and the Christian Church has been told many times and this new industrious narrative makes no substantial addition to our knowledge. But Dr. Muller has studied the inscriptions of

the period, and his citations, e.g. for the gratitude of pagans to Julian the Apostate (p. 69), are useful, though not every conclusion drawn from the inscriptions will carry conviction. Because from the reigns of Valentinian and Valens he can adduce three examples of provincial pagan priesthoods, can one regard this as proof that 'Julian's reform of the priesthood was fairly efficient'? It is unfortunate that the Orcistus inscription, Dessau 6091, has been transformed from a privilege accorded presumably to Christians into a grant of imperial funds for the celebration of pagan rites (p. 24). The best section of the book is the chapter which relates the struggle between Ambrose and Symmachus over the Altar of Victory. In his closing pages Dr. Muller collects some evidence for later survivals of paganism; for such survivals he would have found much evidence in the sermons of St. Caesarius of Arles (usefully summarized by R. Boese in a Marburg dissertation of the year 1909).

Dr. Muller's treatment of Constantine's religious policy is hardly satisfactory. In the development of that policy it would appear to some students that the Donatist Controversy is of primary significance, but to it Dr. Muller devotes a single sentence. If the Constantinian documents are authentic, there can hardly be room for doubt concerning the Emperor's personal convictions. In this book Dr. Muller, mistrans-

lating Eusebius, carries 'ambiguity' on until the final scene, when with death very near the Emperor realized that he would never reach the Jordan: baptism must come at once—there was no room for hesitation or delay. ἀμφιβολία, as Heikel remarked, does not mean 'Zweideutigkeit'. Some statements are surprisingly positive. 'We have no right to conclude that Constantine prohibited sacrifices', but there remains *C.Th.* 16. 10. 2. The reforms introduced by Constantine's legislation 'were of such a nature that it is impossible to ascribe them to his Christian faith' (p. 16); doubtless the influence of Christianity has often been exaggerated, but is not this to go to the opposite extreme? A student of Byzantine history might hesitate to accept Dr. Muller's dictum: 'the Christian State was doomed to failure since Christianity contained elements which proved detrimental to the already declining Roman Empire' (p. 128). It is surprising to find that after

the devastating criticism of Grégoire, Kugener, and Peeters the *Life of Porphyry* by Mark the Deacon is still treated (p. 131) as an unquestioned historical source.

The printing of the book is astonishingly eccentric: it seems hard to believe that Dr. Muller can have seen any proofs despite the insertion of a slip correcting five unimportant errata. When the main verb of a sentence is omitted one can guess the sense (p. 26); one can strike out a line which has strayed into the translation of an imperial constitution (p. 109); but the statement from Julian's *Contra Galilaeos* that 'the Christians went over the corpse of the Jew' may give the reader pause until he turns to the Greek ἀφέντες θεοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰουδαίων μεταβῆναι νεκρὸν (194 D). 'In internal silence' is an unexpected rendering of Ammian's *perenni silentio* (22. 10. 7). The book should not have been published in this form. N. H. BAYNES.

London.

IMPERIAL PUBLIC WORKS

Frank Card BOURNE: *The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians*. (Princeton dissertation.) Pp. vi + 76. Princeton, N.J.: privately printed, 1946. Paper.

ABOUT 'classified lists' such as this there can be no half-measures. They are either good or bad, useful or useless. There can be little doubt that this list falls into the second category.

The author's conception of classification is subjective and pays scant regard to the probable needs of the users of such a list. A section entitled 'Augustus—Aqueducts and Water Supply' (p. 26), for example, lists in chronological order measures taken by Augustus, Agrippa, and Tiberius for the construction, maintenance, and repair of these works. There are no sub-headings, either geographical or based on the differing nature, scale, and purpose of the items specified. Four consecutive items (Nos. 18–21) concern 'cisterns in Egypt on roads to the Red Sea from Koptos', an aqueduct at Ephesus, the 'Pont du Gard', and the appointment by Augustus

tus of 'Commissioners over the Water Supply' (where, is not stated). Five sections on this pattern, into the more voluminous of which broad and arbitrarily variable geographical divisions are introduced, and a section of general remarks are presented for each Emperor's reign. Between them, and between reigns, there is no attempt at co-ordination. There is, moreover, no index. As a typical consequence there is no visible connexion between a bald statement on pp. 29–30 (Classification: 'Coloniae—Gaul'), that 'some building' by Augustus at Nemausus may be 'postulated', and the enumeration of four buildings of Augustan date there on p. 21 ('Edifices—The Gallic Provinces and Spain'), two roads on p. 25 ('Commerce and the Exploitation of Natural Resources—The Gauls'), an aqueduct on p. 27 ('Aqueducts and Water Supply'), and gates and walls on p. 28 ('Building for Empire Defence'). Finally, the claim of a number of items to be classified as they are is far from clear, e.g. p. 60, no. 6, 'work' by Vespasian on the

walls of Rome (for which, incidentally, Plin. *N.H.* iii. 66, the only reference cited, provides no evidence) as 'Building for Empire Defence'.

Even this confusion could be excused if detail were good. The following, however, are characteristic examples of completely self-contained items listed. It is to be noted that there is no uniformity in the manner in which they are presented.

P. 21, no. 51. (Classification: 'Augustus—Edifices—The Gallic Provinces and Spain'.) '16 B.C. The Maison Carrée at Nemausus attributed to Agrippa by Espérandieu (*La Maison Carrée*, Nîmes, 1922, pp. 7 ff.).' This is not even intelligible unless *C.I.L.* xiii. 3156 is mentioned. Moreover, Espérandieu, although attributing the building to Agrippa, in fact dates it to 20–12 B.C., and that on pp. 12 ff. of the pamphlet named. He

does this more accessibly in *C.R. Acad. Inscr. et B.L.*, 1919, pp. 332 ff., and for reasons which need to be specified.

P. 47, no. 47. ('Claudius—Commerce and the Exploitation of Natural Resources—The Balkan Area.') 'Near Virunum in Noricum (*C.I.L.* iii. 5709).' This also is unintelligible, until it has been ascertained that the inscription is on a milestone, found within a few hundred yards of Virunum, apparently on the road to Celeia. Even then the reasons for its inclusion under this heading need some elucidation, among them the reason why Noricum is regarded as lying in the Balkan area.

The list is indeed not merely bad as a list but exhibits few signs of the scholarship we expect from America in works of this nature.

G. R. C. DAVIS.

British Museum.

BAKCHIAS PAPYRI

Erik J. KNUDTZON: *Bakchiastexte und andere Papyri der Lunder Papyrus-sammlung mit Kommentar herausgegeben.* Pp. 139; 8 plates, 1 chart. Lund: Ohlsson, 1946. Paper, 10 kr.

PAPYRI often provide material for a doctoral thesis on the Continent, although rarely in this country, but it is not often that the results are as satisfactory as they are here. K. writes with vigour and lucidity, discusses thoroughly certain problems arising from his texts (his essay on the εἰσκριτικόν is an instance of his sound judgement), and does not waste his space or the reader's time in unnecessary annotation. He has the advantage that the texts he publishes are unusually homogeneous; eight, or possibly ten, out of fourteen are concerned with the temple of 'the great god Soknobraisis' in the little village of Bakchias on the north-western edge of the Fayûm depression. These must have belonged to a temple archive, now scattered in Cairo, Lund, and Yale. K. gives us a good picture of the affairs of an Egyptian temple, its difficulties with the Roman Government (then, as always, unimaginative in its handling of Egyptian problems), its ritual (illustrated by

an inventory of musical instruments), and of its personnel. In an appendix he makes a study of the priests and their families; though priesthoods were not hereditary, membership was in fact confined to a few Egyptian families (hence it is surprising to find a priest of the crocodile god Sobk bearing the name of Psenathumis son of Priscus). In the late second century A.D. there were fifteen priests, one of whom was attached to Isis, another to Boubastis; K.'s discussions of the relations between the presiding deity and the other gods whom he obligingly housed and of the meaning of ἱερόν deserve attention. The last of the religious texts, a list of the members of the Guild of the Dioscuri and an account of the expenditure incurred at the ceremony of robing the divine effigies, takes us into a different atmosphere; here the names are all Greek and of the twenty members seven are Roman veterans. To the parallels quoted should now be added the important texts and discussions in P. Mich. V. Of the remaining papyri, No. 12, a charm designed to protect a small girl against various powers of evil, is complete and of more than usual interest (note the

use of *καταργεῖν* in a sense very close to that in which St. Paul employs it).

K. concludes his volume with an engaging study of the life of the village as known from these and other papyri; it was dominated by the temple of the crocodile god and so built that all the houses looked to this focal point. Nonetheless, Homer and Demosthenes, even Hippocrates, found readers here. Its agriculture, its canal system, its importance as a customs station on the desert route to Memphis, protected by a unit of the Arabian archers (P.Amh. 77. 4 note), are briefly described; it is a pity that the evidence connecting the customs account SB. 7365 with Bakchias was not available to K.

The texts and plates together are evidence that K. is a careful reader, but his deviations from the accepted method

of publication, e.g. in the matter of brackets, are unfortunate and mean that where there is no plate one cannot be always sure what the exact reading is. In No. 9 the abbreviation left unread at the end of l. 3 is Ἀροῖ(νοῖρῶν) and in l. 2 of 13 the name of the village with the *statio* should, I suspect, be read Ἰβ()κεῖ i.e. Ἰβ(ωνος) (εἰκοσιπενταρούρων); ἡτωρ in 10. 2 may be the termination of ἐκλήμπτωρ; and in 11. ii. 8 the plate suggests the reading Διογένης. Any edition of papyri provides scope for such suggestions, and these are not meant to convey that this edition, carried out with great care and obvious zest, is anything but a thoroughly competent piece of work.

C. H. ROBERTS.

St. John's College,
Oxford.

GREEK AND ROMAN ART

Hansjörg BLOESCH: *Antike Kunst in der Schweiz*. Pp. 228, 79 plates, 17 figs. Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1943. Cloth, 28 Sw. fr.

IN 1942 an exhibition of Greek and Roman art was held in Berne. The specimens displayed were borrowed from museums and collectors in Switzerland, and fifty selected objects are here illustrated and discussed. The photographs, which were all taken by the author, have been reproduced by a new method which avoids retouching. The results are excellent and the plates in half-tone admirable, and the whole is a fine example of book production. Not all the fifty objects reproduced are, however, masterpieces, in spite of the sub-title. The Geometric bronze animals, for instance, are good of their kind, but nothing more, and one or two pieces such as the so-called Lysimachus, a doubtful identification, are second-rate.

Two of the objects reproduced are well known. One is the Steinhäuser head, which derives probably from the same original as the Apollo Belvedere and is described as a copy of the first century A.D. after a Greek bronze original of the fourth century B.C. The

author wisely refrains from attributing it to any known artist. The other is the Grächwil hydria which, in spite of the restorations, is a notable piece of Greek bronze work. The author is probably right in recognizing the group of the *πύρνια θηρῶν* as Laconian in origin and therefore in attributing the hydria to a Tarentine workshop of about 600 B.C.

Among the interesting pieces are a Plato and a pseudo-Seneca, and the author remarks that the number of copies of the latter and the poor quality of many of them suggest that the head was valued more as a portrait than as a work of art. He concludes that it is a good copy, probably Hadrianic, of a Greek original of about 100 B.C. The small bronze bust of Caligula deserves notice and so does the Hellenistic relief of Heracles and the hydra.

Among the vases the outstanding piece is a black-glazed Attic hydria of the fourth century, the brilliance of which is well rendered in the splendid plate devoted to it. This vase is really a masterpiece and can hardly be surpassed for the beauty of its shape. The elegant form and the wonderful execution show the skill of the Attic potters. There are three black-figured amphorae

illustrating the exploits of Heracles, Geryon, Triton, and the Nemean Lion. The last is attributed to the Andocides Painter, who, the author suggests, may have been, like his master Exekias, both painter and potter. There are also an example of the Antimenes Painter's work and an amphora by the Pan Painter, with a flying Nike on the front. A fine vase beautifully illustrated is a Rhodian oenochoe. Two or three coins, some jewellery, and a few 'Tanagra' figur-

ines cover other aspects of ancient art.

The book is welcome as figuring so well examples of Greek and Roman art not easily accessible, but it would have added to its usefulness if the numbers of the objects had been added to the captions of the plates. There is a brief introduction on ancient art, and the specialist will find details, notes, and references in a separate section at the end.

A. J. B. WACE.

ATTIC RED-FIGURE VASES

GISELA M. A. RICHTER: *Attic Red-figured Vases. A Survey*. Pp. xvii+200; 33 line-drawings, 92 photographs. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth, 14s. net.

PROFESSOR BEAZLEY'S *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* has presented archaeologists and scholars with an enormous body of material arranged for future work. More than 15,000 vases made between 530 and 380 B.C. are grouped under more than 400 painters; their proveniences, inscriptions, and subjects are indexed. At the same time Dr. H. Bloesch in Bern is doing pioneer work in attributing vases to potters. The interplay of these two lines of work will undoubtedly give us a far clearer picture of Athenian potteries and the economics of Athenian life; on the other hand, the accurate dating of these vases played against their proveniences may give some idea of the incidence and direction of Athenian foreign trade. An index of non-mythological subjects is lacking and perhaps should not be attempted until Professor Beazley has published his *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*; but then we shall be in a position to assess our knowledge of Athenian private life at various dates. The mythological subjects, however, have been indexed by Dr. Paul Jacobsthal; how much light can be thrown on literary texts from this source can be seen from Professor Dodds's commentary on the *Bacchae*.

Miss Richter, who has 'adopted throughout the attributions given in that epoch-making book', Beazley's

Attic Red-figure Vase-painters, has in the main confined herself to detailed stylistic analysis of some 200 of Beazley's painters. The analysis is reinforced by admirable detailed pictures, mostly of single figures, in which the distinctive treatment of drapery, ears, muscles, ankles, etc., can be shown. Something like a third of the examples are taken from the vases of the Metropolitan Museum, because the book is modelled on Miss Richter's two-volume catalogue of 1936 and will 'serve as a guide to that collection'. Frequent references are, however, given to pieces in other museums and pictures of them can be found in any reasonably good university library. The strong points of Miss Richter's survey are first an excellent introduction on shapes, inscriptions, and technique, secondly clear and precise chronology, thirdly very good cross-references to sculpture, and fourthly scientific nomenclature for anatomy; it is also good that she carries on the story to the end of the fourth century, although the section on Kerch vases is disproportionately short. It is perhaps a pity when so many vases are noticed that the Makron aryballos in Oxford with boys playing with toy chariots and the Chicago painter's Polynices and Eriphyle are omitted. The book is too full of detail to make easy reading, but it will be an extremely useful reference book for students just because it shows the different painters in their relation to one another and describes their styles accurately.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

MYTHOLOGICAL TRADITION

Jean SEZNEC: *La Survivance des Dieux Antiques*. Essai sur le rôle de la tradition mythologique dans l'humanisme et dans l'art de la Renaissance. Pp. 371; 47 plates. London: Warburg Institute, 1940. Paper, 30s. net.

DR. SEZNEC describes his book in his subtitle as an essay on the role of mythological tradition in humanism and the art of the Renaissance. This is, however, less of a limiting clause than it might at first appear, for his main thesis is the gradual passage from the Medieval to the Renaissance outlook. In men's constant preoccupation with the ancient gods he finds a bridge between the two periods and he therefore deals largely with the continuous modifications of mythology throughout the whole intervening time between the earliest classical formulas and the seventeenth century. It is a wide field and one that, though not untrodden, is still comparatively uncharted. Studies, largely centred on the Warburg Institute, have prepared the way and done much to elaborate the technique of this form of research, but Dr. Sez nec's book is the first attempt at an exhaustive survey. The result is of considerable importance. The cult of the gods survived through three main methods of interpretation: the historical, in which they are founders of races and dynasties, a realm of fancy where the chosen ancestor might be Jason, Hercules, some Trojan hero, or some eponymous figure such as Brut or Scota, Pharaoh's daughter; secondly the physical, where as creative forces the gods become assimilated to the stars and exercise all the astral influences of which both Medieval and Renaissance men were so profoundly convinced; and thirdly the allegorical, with its vast range of subtle interpretation and growth of emblematic meanings. Sometimes one aspect predominates, sometimes they are curiously fused. As he tracks his theme through treatises and visual manifestations Dr. Sez nec produces a commentary on the thought of the times which is frequently unexpected and always illuminating. He shows how

readily the Middle Ages adapted the past to their own needs and their contemporary forms, and that in contrast the Renaissance, while adhering to many of the implicit beliefs, had a new sense of style in the formulation of them and realized that the understanding of history required a sense of the past as well as a sense of continuity. The pleasure with which they treated the more voluptuous topics was a contribution of their own, and one not without considerable significance. The sensuous nature of so many of the themes reasserts itself as the forms in which it is shown become more naturalistic.

It is impossible in a brief notice to indicate the range of this very varied book. Inevitably some topics are less fully or less successfully dealt with than others. When some strongly personal genius such as Botticelli or Titian or Poussin (though he appears but as an epilogue) handles the material, there is hardly room in a few pages to elaborate his exact place in the argument, and we are aware of a slackening in the reasoning and a certain insufficiency in the treatment. The influence of plastic formulas which did not always remain attached to their proper subjects is a question posed but not fully explored, and Dr. Sez nec is on the whole happier while dealing with literary subjects than he is with works of visual art. The book is well illustrated, but for the most part the plates are used as types of particular treatments and not subjected to an exhaustive analysis. In a book which, excluding a full bibliography and indexes, has only 290 pages of text, this would hardly have been possible, and within this scope rigorous selection and discipline in digression, however inviting, was necessary to set out the essentials of so complex a story. Dr. Sez nec has made available a reasoned, widely informed, and well-documented study of an important field of human speculation, which constantly serves to remind us how partial is our knowledge of even the most familiar periods of the past.

The book was being printed abroad at the outbreak of the war and it is only now that copies, after many difficulties, are becoming available. There are a certain number of misprints and pages

288 and 289 are transposed, but otherwise it shows little signs of the hindrances that attended its production.

T. S. R. BOASE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

ROMAN LAW

R. W. LEE: *The Elements of Roman Law*. With a translation of the *Institutes of Justinian*. Revised edition. Pp. xxiii + 489. London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1946. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

ROMAN LAW, as Professor Lee justly claims, is 'one of the great things which have happened in the world'. The legal systems of a good half of the modern world can trace their descent directly or indirectly back to the law of Justinian. Even in the Common Law countries the young student finds an acquaintance with the *Institutes of Roman Law* valuable, not only for purposes of comparison, but also as an introduction to jurisprudence, the general science of law. But few law students nowadays have enough Latin to read even their *Institutes* with ease, and some examining bodies have abandoned the requirement of Latin in their Roman Law examination. Is Roman Law, then, to become a subject studied, by the average student, entirely at second hand from modern manuals and cram-books? Professor Lee has made a gallant and very successful attempt to save it from this further degradation. 'It seems lamentable', he writes, and all Romanists will agree, 'that anyone should be credited with a knowledge of Roman Law who has not read Justinian's *Institutes*. If students cannot or will not read the original, they may, perhaps, be induced to read a translation.' He therefore produced in 1944 his new translation with an Introduction and Commentary designed primarily for the law student of to-day, for whom Moyle and Sandars are too formidable, but by no means to be disregarded by the advanced scholar for

whom Moyle and Sandars are in places out of date. His aim was practical and his execution masterly, as might be expected from so distinguished a scholar and so experienced a teacher, and students and teachers in schools where they base their teaching on Justinian (to a lesser extent the older universities whose curriculum is more historical and takes account of Gaius—Professor de Zulueta is providing for their needs) have gratefully and admiringly accepted his *Elements* as their standard work. So favourable has been its reception that now, after two years, the publishers have felt justified in reissuing it at a reduced price. In this new issue Professor Lee has taken the opportunity to revise the text, incorporating some of the suggestions made by reviewers of the first issue (notably by Professor Duff in the *Law Quarterly Review*, vol. lxi), re-writing a few sections and correcting a number of misprints, but he has made no extensive or substantial changes. None was needed. Professor Lee's book was, and is, the best work in English for the law students to whom he addresses himself. And it may be useful to some readers of the *Classical Review* to know that it is also an excellent book—in Professor Duff's opinion, 'the best in the English language'—for the older scholar who has not attended to Roman Law and wants to learn something not so much of its growth as of its mature structure, the system of Justinian which had so great an influence on the lawyers and philosophers of so many succeeding generations.

A. H. CAMPBELL.

University of Edinburgh.

SHORT REVIEWS

James HUTTON: *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the year 1800*. Pp. xi+822. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1946. Cloth, \$5.00.

THIS book follows the same plan as its predecessor, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the year 1800*, which was reviewed in C.R. xlix (1935), p. 152. Both works are meant to lead up to a study of the *Anthology* and its influence in English literature. The bulk of the present work consists of a formidable list of writers, neo-Latin for the Netherlands (beginning with Erasmus) and both neo-Latin and vernacular for France (ending with Chénier), who translated or imitated one or more of the epigrams. The lists of references and of tabloid biographies are enlivened by a goodly number of quotations. They serve as materials for the most valuable and interesting portion of the book, the introduction (pp. 1-78), which deals with the history of Greek studies in France and explains why, for example, the Greek form of epigram was consciously rejected during the great age of French Epigram (1650 onwards): for French taste in the eighteenth century it seemed too naïve, too like the 'mâdrigal', and far inferior to the 'pointed' or satirical epigram, of which Martial supplied the model. As Lord Chesterfield wrote in 1746, with un-Gallic bluntness but in accordance with the French literary attitude in his century, 'Martial has wit . . . but I recommend the Greek epigrams to your supreme contempt'. But from 1750 onwards there was a revival of Hellenism, though Greek had almost vanished from French education; and the *Anthology* returned to favour, particularly after Voltaire, though he had no very intimate knowledge of it, decisively announced his preference for the Greek over the Latin type of epigram in 1771.

University of Sheffield.

J. TATE.

Friedrich MEHMEI: *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius*. Untersuchungen über die Zeitvorstellung in der antiken epischen Erzählung. Pp. 132. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1940. Paper.

THIS treatise is a systematic and very detailed inquiry into the portrayal of 'time' in ancient epic. M. first contrasts the divergent attitudes of Homer and Apollonius Rhodius, as being to Virgil the 'old' and 'new' epic respectively; next he discusses the relation of Virgil himself to both of these; and in conclusion he develops the relation of Virgil to the later epic to about 400. He makes the essential distinction (p. 61) that time in Homer is momentary, whereas in Apollonius it is a continuous basis of events; this definition is used as the starting-point for the Virgilian inquiry.

M. goes into great detail to support his contention, and develops his argument with obvious sincerity. But in an inquiry of this kind, which is not wholly factual, much depends inevitably on individual interpretation and individual attitude. That one should be willing to go some of the dis-

tance with him but yet hesitate to go the whole way is no reflection on the integrity of the writer or the honesty of his purpose.

M. M. GILLIES.

University College, Hull.

E. Patrick PARKS: *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts under the Early Empire*. (Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXIII, No. 2.) Pp. 122. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Paper, \$1.25.

THE main interest of this well-documented study lies not in new facts but in its emphasis. The author is primarily concerned to show that the rhetorical schools were not operating *in vacuo*. Though there was no opening for a Cicero and the licence of republican forensic oratory had suffered a restraint which was resented in some quarters, the courts were still providing the advocate with an ample field and a competence, and the skill which the declamations presumably developed was just that which the advocate, as opposed to the juriconsult, needed for success in his profession. All this, which he supports in detail, is true. Though some writers have appraised the facts justly, there have been from others too many sweeping statements, based on misleading half-truths, which call for this correction, and it is well to have the scattered evidence clearly set out. He goes on to develop more briefly the argument that the influence of the schools on the literature of the time has been exaggerated or misrepresented. That apparatus borrowed from the schools appears in the writers of the Silver Age no one can deny, but the declamations were themselves examples of a stylistic trend which left its mark on almost all the productions of the age. Here his treatment is somewhat superficial: he speaks of 'floridity' as a mark of later Latin, though that is not its most characteristic feature, and when he condemns as fallacious the view that the later literature 'bears the imprint of rhetoric', he does not seem to realize that most of Latin literature, for obvious reasons, bears the imprint of rhetoric: the question is *what* rhetoric. What were the origins of the new style of which the declamations were one of the most striking manifestations is a matter outside his inquiry. But within the limits he has set himself this is a very useful piece of work, and it is a pity that the translations of two of the *controversiae*, which he gives as illustrations, contain a number of errors.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Sigmund SKARD: *The Use of Color in Literature*. A Survey of Research. (Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. XC, No. 3.) Pp. 87. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1946. Paper.

IN this survey, the concentrated result of much reading and thought, the Professor of American

Literature in the University of Oslo aims at giving a conspectus of the multifarious methods which research has pursued in the investigation of colour-sense in relation to literature, and an appraisal of such conclusions as have been reached. Classical literature occupies an important place in the earlier history of the subject, since it was Gladstone's Homeric theory which gave the first impetus to a study which later investigators, working on philological, physiological, and psychological lines, have since carried into regions of which Gladstone never dreamed. In recent years Müller-Boré and Schultz have done useful work on colour in early Greek poetry, while Rudberg has tried to place colour-sense in its setting in Greek life and thought; both in Greek literature and in Latin a major problem is the separation of tradition from realism, of cliché from perception. The classical student who wishes to pursue a subject in which much remains to be done will be especially grateful for the classified bibliography which Dr. Skard has compiled; of its 1,183 items, 84 are concerned with classical literature.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Sister Mary Magdeleine MUELLER: *The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, LXVII.) Pp. xv+269. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Paper.

In 1939 there appeared in this series W. J. Halliwell's monograph on *The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great*. Now there follows a study of his vocabulary. The plan of the work, to quote the author's preface, is twofold: 'in the first place, to observe the author's own choice of words and the special meaning which he ascribes to them, and secondly, to evaluate his vocabulary in relation to that of his predecessors in the Classical and Christian literary tradition'. The method followed is in general that of similar vocabulary studies which have already appeared in the series. There are five sections—(1) Late Latin words, i.e. Neologisms, Words of recent coinage, Foreign loan words, (2) Semantics, (3) Words rare before late Latin, (4) Ecclesiastical terms, (5) Titles of address—with a General Summary and Conclusion, and an Index.

The whole analysis shows that Leo was no innovator in language. The section on neologisms contains only twenty-seven words, and of these two are proper names and eight proper adjectives. By his time the main body of Christian vocabulary had been created and his language is on the whole that of his great predecessors, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. The Ciceronian influence is still strong.

Of those shortcomings which the work shows in common with earlier publications in the series, and which may be said to be inherent in the plan, criticism need not again be made here. But one's impression of thorough and accurate work is overlaid with some suspicion when one finds listed, for example, on p. 139, a verb *reciprocare*, where a fuller quotation of the two passages cited would have shown that here is no verb but the adj.

reciprocus. The classical significations, too, given in the section on semantic change, show too frequently a mechanical and superficial use of the lexical authorities—e.g. *caste* = 'sincerely', *festivitas* = 'holiday' are the only meanings given. And on this side of the Atlantic at least *scrinia* = 'letter-box' has an odd ring.

I. M. CAMPBELL.

University of Glasgow.

Excavations at Dura-Europos. Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season of Work, 1935-6. Part II: The Necropolis. By N. P. TOLL. Pp. viii+150; 65 plates, 52 figs. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth and boards, 27s. 6d. net.

OUT of a total of a thousand catacombs in the desert bordering Dura, fifty-two were found in an unusually good state of preservation, under a mound of refuse which obviously came from a baths furnace of the Roman Empire. These, in addition to some of the others and a number of isolated graves, provide a very fair sample of the city's burials. But grave-robbing was habitual there in ancient times, and the climate has disposed of most of what was not worth stealing. The bones and the wooden coffins have sometimes remained visible but disintegrate at a touch, and any softer objects have vanished. It appears, however, that singularly little equipment can have been buried. Ornaments and toilet goods were placed beside dead women, but the men were given nothing except pots that contained food and presumably water. (The unexplained abbreviation 'c.w.' stands for 'common ware'.) A terra-cotta Hermes is the only subject of religious significance. There is only one inscription, an uncompleted date in A.D. 35-6, while two names on the wall of another tomb are the only graffiti. The burial vaults are not decorated; probably they were never opened except to receive fresh bodies, for which space was made by clearing bones from loculi filled long before. In such circumstances the excavators have done well to obtain sufficient material for a volume. It has, naturally, less to say of the burials than of the burial-places. The catacombs include some trichlinia, ascribed to the early Hellenistic citizens, and some individual tombs, but otherwise follow the Syrian and Egyptian pattern in which loculi radiate from a chamber; eight types of such are distinguished and more or less dated. The ruins of a few tower-tombs standing above ground are carefully compared with the similar structures at Palmyra.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

H. and H. A. FRANKFORT, John A. WILSON, Thor-keld JACOBSEN, William A. IRWIN: *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*. An Essay on Speculative Thought in the Ancient Near East. Pp. vii+401. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1946. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

THESE lectures explain to the 'educated layman' that the mythologies of Egypt and Mesopotamia

resulted from the 'concrete' type of thinking which does not clear itself from the imagery in which it is expressed. Most of these myths are not pure myth; they contain elements of speculation. But they are not allegorical, since their intellectual meanings are strictly inseparable from their imaginative setting.

This point of view is at least tenable; but difficulties arise in its application. The vigorous account of Hebrew thought asserts that Israel 'far transcended' this mythopoeic thinking, thanks to a 'critical intellectualism'. But the authors of the final section accuse Israel of creating a new myth, that of 'the will of God'. They find that the 'emancipation of thought from myth' was the work of the Greeks, particularly of Parmenides. They hold that the persistent Greek view of the world as an 'intelligible whole' 'cannot be proved', but apparently do not see that they are thus accusing both Greek thought and modern science of mythical assumptions in the same way as they criticized as 'mythical' the Hebrew belief in the will of God. This final section lists some echoes of Near Eastern beliefs to be found in Greek mythology, and then in a dozen pages, founded on Burnet and Cornford, sketches the development of Greek philosophy up to Parmenides on the naïve assumption that the appearance of something resembling subjective idealism means that thought has achieved 'autonomy'. It is a readable chapter, but it rests on confused ideas on the essential differences between myth and religion, science and philosophy.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

Stig WIKANDER: *Feuerpriester in Kleinasien und Iran*. (Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, XI.) Pp. xii+244. Lund: Gleerup, 1946. Paper.

THE scope of this journal and the limitations of the reviewer's knowledge combine to forbid a detailed criticism of this monograph. It is nevertheless a work to be kept in mind and referred to on occasion by any classicist who is interested in the contacts of Greek with Oriental religion. The author gives a careful and abundantly documented criticism of words which mean, or have been supposed to mean, priests attending on the sacred fire, whether Zoroastrian or not, drawing chiefly on Persian of all periods but also on Sanskrit and Armenian, while a list of Latin and Greek words at the end of his index will serve as a guide to the student who is not an orientalist. His researches were encouraged by that expert on Greek religion, M. P. Nilsson; perhaps the most obvious point of contact with our studies is the two chapters (III and IV) dealing with the cult of Anahita, the Anaitis of Hellenistic and Latin writers.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Dumbarton Oaks Papers. * Number 3. By ERNST KITZINGER, MILTON V. ANASTOS, and HERBERT BLOCH. Pp. 224; 258 ill. on plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London:

Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth and boards, 42s. net.

THIS volume, though Dr. Kitzinger regrets (and his readers will regret) the war-time necessity of dispensing with a coloured plate, is produced in a style which post-war Europe can only envy. It contains four papers on subjects of interest to students of the Christian Roman Empire.

Dr. Kitzinger, whose two papers constitute two-thirds of the volume, writes on the 'Horse and Lion' tapestry acquired in 1939 by the Dumbarton Oaks Collection; but his discussion of its date (6th century?) and country of origin (ending with a *non liquet* as between Persia and the Mediterranean) leads him, as his sub-title indicates, into a general 'Study in Coptic and Sassanian Textile Design', and further, to a consideration of the art-motif of the pillar-capital formed of two animal *protomai* back to back, which is reproduced in the textile. The collection of photographs of over eighty representative Byzantine, Persian, and derivative animal- or bird-capitals will be useful to any student of the subject who knows where to look for it.

Dr. Kitzinger also writes on 'The Early Christian Town of Stobi' in Yugoslav Macedonia, giving, in fact, an interim 'publication' of that interesting site (excavated at intervals between 1917 and 1939) in order to collect and make accessible the material hitherto scattered over many publications pending the 'large monograph, which' (the author stout-heartedly writes, in 1943) 'we hope the Yugoslavs will produce one day'. This article, too, is beautifully illustrated, and one can only regret that it was not made still more accessible by being itself published as a separate monograph.

The same comments may be made on Herbert Bloch's historical article on Monte Cassino as a meeting-point between Byzantium and the West in the early Middle Ages. In fact, all these papers—apart from the brief article by M. V. Anastos, arguing for an Alexandrian origin for Cosmas Indicopleustes—suggest the same question: Would it not be in the best interests of learning if the editorial committee of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library would publish its major papers as separate monographs, each with its own title? This method would bring them within reach of the pocket of some European individual buyers as well as of libraries; and, moreover, it would ensure that hard-worked library staffs should record them under their proper subjects, instead of—as one feels might happen, even in America—confronting us with the bald legend: 'Dumbarton Oaks: see United Nations Organization.'

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

Hermann BROCH: *The Death of Virgil*. Translated by Jean STARR UNTERMEYER. Pp. 494. London: Routledge, 1946. Cloth, 30s. net.

THIS is a very ambitious book. Herr Broch, whose method seems to owe much to James Joyce, has attempted to make Virgil's last hours at Brundisium into a kind of symphonic poem, on a portentous scale. Virgil is delirious from fever, and we spend most of the time within the sick

man's 'stream of consciousness', struggling with sentences which, as the translator feelingly says, are 'among the longest in literature', written in a style which is fantastically Teutonic and a syntax which, according to Herr Broch, is 'purely functional', whatever that may mean. Virgil has a lucid interval towards the middle of the book and his conversation with Augustus is comparatively easy reading. We get some unexpected sidelights on Roman literary life and are gratified to learn that Virgil is a good anti-Nazi. The improvement unfortunately does not last. Virgil relapses into a delirium which continues almost unbroken until page 482.

Some idea of the book's quality will be gathered from the following extract. 'Layer on layer, one above the other, the bareness of a no-heaven was

covered by the round bow of the bay-window, both arching over the sepulchre, both permeated by un-space even though shot through by the velvet blackness of the whole star-studded round of the sky, and the domes of the universe were intergrown by elms in an immeasurable expansion of all discrepancies and distances which, at the same time, was an immeasurable contraction of them; the landscape-lack pierced the landscape and was pierced by it, symbolic in its lack of symbol, just as the animal element penetrated the trance-death and was penetrated by it in turn . . .'

Herr Broch's work may appeal to a certain number of readers who have not had a classical education.

K. R. POTTER.

University of Edinburgh.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sirs,

In *C.R.* lxi, p. 57, Professor Hackforth dismisses as 'absurd' the generally accepted rendering of Plato's γενναῖον τι ἐν ψευδομένους, 'noble lie'. May I draw attention to the note in the second edition of my *Aeschylus and Athens*, pp. 453-4, in which, after an examination of the word γενναῖος and a comparison with the proverbial καλὸν ψεῦδος, discussed in my edition of the *Oresteia* (vol. ii, pp. 73-4), the conclusion is reached that this expression is an oxymoron of the normal type and that the meaning can only be 'noble lie'?

Yours truly

GEORGE THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

Dear Sirs,

Leake in his *Travels in the Morea*, i, p. 449, has an interesting account of a boat in use in his day. The gunwales were enveloped in withies 'to protect it from the waves or from danger of a sudden heel'. This is a curious and telling commentary on the boat built by Odysseus with Calypso's help (*Od.* v. 233 ff.), when 'he fenced it with wattled osier withies from stem to stern, to be a bulwark against the wave, and piled up wood to back them'. Leake is well worth reading, although he seems largely to be forgotten to-day.

Yours truly

H. MICHELL.

Macmaster University.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLII. 3: JULY, 1947

E. J. Bickerman, *Apocryphal Correspondence of Pyrrhus*: examines the letters exchanged between P. and Laevinus in Dion. Hal. *A.R.* xix. 9-10; from opening formulae concludes that D.'s authority was a Roman annalist writing in Greek between 170 and 120, probably Acilius; from the contents of P.'s letter that it is based on a genuine one of 280 B.C., but coloured by later experience of Greeks. E. H. Haight, *Menander at the Sabine Farm*: sees the influence of Menander on Horace in the dramatic form of the *Satires*. G. Vlastos, *Equality and Justice in Early Greek Cosmogonies*: the pre-Socratics make the assumption that equality is the guarantee of cosmic justice or harmony. H. W. Miller, *The Parabasis of the Thesmophoriazousae of Aristophanes*: suggests that A. got the idea from the defence of women in Euripides' *Melanippe Desmotis*. C. A. Lynch, *Agamemnon 1323-6*: defends the manuscript reading (with Jacobs's $\delta\mu\omicron\nu$)—'I pray that the avengers of my death may make retribution along with my murderers': only with the final $\delta\mu\omicron\nu$ does the audience realize that Cassandra is cursing Orestes as well as Clytae-

mnestra. B. D. Meritt, *Honours to Faustina at Corinth*: confirms West's suggestion that the inscription recording honours to F. (*Corinth*, viii. 2, no. 22) was that mentioned by Wheler and gives a fuller version based on Wheler's notes (B.M. Add. 35334) made before the stone was mutilated. R. H. Crum on Petronius 42. 6-7 proposes (*feminam*) *neminem*.

XLII. 4: OCTOBER, 1947

B. B. Boyer, *Insular Contribution to Mediaeval Literary Tradition of the Continent* (I): notes on the tradition of Ps.-Cyprian, *De xii abusivis saeculi*, and of Aldhelm. A. H. Krappe, *Ἀπόλλων Ὀνός*: the tradition (Pind. *P.* x. 31-6) of a Hyperborean cult of Apollo with sacrifice of donkeys and the legends of Marsyas and Midas point to an Anatolian cult of an ass-god, identified with Apollo, which was brought by northern invaders from the Danubian region. W. K. Pritchett, *Julian Dates and Greek Calendars*: concludes that 'the calendric basis for temple-orientation' is too uncertain to give reliable results. E. E. Burrows, *Breaks in Conversation and the Text of Petronius*: several emendations and suppletions are rendered unnecessary by the supposition of aposiopesis or broken

utterance. A. E. Gordon adds further notes on the Californian 'Homo bonus' inscription published by him in 1944. E. M. Sandford notes the appearance of the wheel of Fortune as an *exemplum* in Honorius of Autun (Migne, clxxii. 1056-7). A. S. Pease suggests that the natural basis of the legend of Ocrisia (Ovid, *F.* vi. 627-34) is the mushroom *Ithyphallus impudicus*.

EOS

XL: 1939

T. Milewski, *Sur la monophthongaison des diphthongues dans les langues indo-européennes*: mechanical assimilation to the stronger element in the diphthong is modified by 'intelligent' selection, to preserve semantic oppositions: e.g. in languages which possessed the vowels *i* and *ū*, but not *ē* and *ō*, the diphthongs *ei* and *ou* are simplified to *ē* and *ō* instead of following the normal assimilation to *i* and *ū*. H. Markowski, *De Messapia Inscriptione Thotoriae Basterbinæ*: select bibliography; detailed discussion of each word, and translation into Greek and Latin: concludes that the Messapian language of later third century B.C. was practically a Greek dialect. L. Strzelecki, *Studia Isidorea*: (1) *De Isidori Etym.* i. 27 *auctoribus*: more than half of this chapter comes from Cassiodorus, *de orthographia* (Lehmann in *Philol.* 72, 1913): of the rest, a few points are taken from Agroecius, *de orthographia*, and the bulk probably from the *libri orthographici* of Verrius Flaccus. (2) *De Isidoro Alcuini auctore*: book entitled *Orthographia Albini Magistri* in G.L. vii, pp. 295-312, is convincingly attributed by Keil to Alcuin, whose sources here were mainly Bede and Cassiodorus. Verbal correspondence with Isidore sometimes due to common origin in Cassiodorus, but other passages, not in Cassiodorus, show that Alcuin used Isidore also. G. Kowalski, *Ad Georgii Moni in Hermogenis Status Commentarii capita scholiis P adiecta adnotationes criticae*. E. Gintowt, *Handlungen περ' ἀνδρας in Aristoteles' Ethica Nicomachea*, v. 10, 1135^b11 ff.: establishes distinction between δὲ ἀνδρας πᾶντων and ἀνδρῶντα ποιεῖν in iii. 2, 1110^b18 ff.: περ' ἀνδρας embraces both, the ἀρχή in the first being ἔκθεσις and in the second ἐν τῷ πᾶντων. J. Swereka, *De articuli apud tragicos Graecos frequentia observatiuncula*: article used more frequently, in lyric parts also, as tragedy develops: Euripides close to later Aeschylus, and Sophocles nearest to prose usage. Statistics, and references to discussions of passages. Maria Próchnicka, *De Anonymi in Hermogenis scriptum περὶ ἰδίων Commentarii recensione in codice Par. Gr. 2983 conservata*: comparison of readings of Pg with those adopted by Walz in *Rhet. Gr.* vii. 861-1087: list of variants not clearly distinguished in Walz's *apparatus*, and some emendations. B. Bilinski, *De Pallene Arcadica*: existence of town Pallene in Arcadia is proved by Paus. viii. 29. 2, which places battle of gods and giants there, 32. 5, 36. 2, and 47. 2, and hints from other authorities, connecting the legend with Arcadia.

XLI: 1940-6

T. Zieliński, *Marginalia Horatiana*: (1) *Sat.* i. 5. 87, the town is *Asculum* in Apulia, properly spelt

Asculum (coins): this was interchangeable with *osculum*, the sign for which is obvious. (2) *De congerie quadam figura Horatiana*: Horace varies the accumulation in the figure *congeries* or *συμπαράθεσις* by dividing it into positive and negative elements (examples). Excessive accumulation in *Od.* i. 7, resembling that in *Epod.* 16, helps to date it early. (3) *Sat.* ii. 5. 103 f., *est* is not equivalent to *licet*, but rather to *prodest*, as in *Ep.* i. 1. 32 (Kiessling saw this: Heinze mistakenly alters his note). Lachmann's *e re est* is unnecessary. (4) *A.P.* 358, read *ut idem*, suggested privately by J. Szebor; similarly *A.P.* 217, read *ut tulit*. T. Sinko, *De ordine quo erotici scriptores Graeci sibi successisse videntur*: differs from the order he proposed in *Eos* xi, 1905. Antonius Diogenes should be removed. (1) Chariton, s. ii; (2) Xenophon Ephesius, s. ii (he imitated Chariton); (3) Iamblichus, between 166 and 180; (4) Longus, c. 200; (5) Achilles Tatius, end of s. ii; (6) Heliodorus Emesenus, reign of Heliogabalus, 217-22, or soon after. G. Kowalski, *De Commentarii in Hermogenis Status e tribus interpretibus confecti (Rh. Gr. iv Wals) recensione in codice Par. Gr. 2923 (Py) obvia*. G. Manteuffel, *Studia Callimachea*: (1) *In Comam Berenices observationes*: suggests several restorations in the Florence fragment (*P.S.I.* ix. 1092): there are many local touches not rendered by Catullus in his translation. (2) *Symbolae ad ἀντιγράμους Callimachi pertinentes*: conjectures on 12 passages in *Pap. Univ. Mediol.* i. 18 (A. Vogliano), Milan, 1937. (3) *De Aetiorum Epilogo*: a fresh interpretation, with new readings and conjectures, of *Pap. Oxyrrh.* vii. 1011, fol. 2 v, 81 ff. (tab. III) = fragm. 9 Pf., 81. Other versions are given, in particular those of G. Coppola and P. Maas. The epilogue was added in the poet's old age, and the last line refers to his *Iambi*. S. Srebrny, *De Sycophantia in Aristophanis 'Avibus' cantico*: discusses the text of Alcaeus fr. 75 D.2, from *Pap. Oxyrrh.* x. 1233, which he concludes is one of the two different songs parodied in *Av.* 1410 ff. V. Steffen, *De auctore satyrorum Oenei filiam expetentium*: agrees that Sophocles was the author: two further arguments for this are (a) close resemblance to Herodas i. 26 ff. (Sophocles is the only writer of satyr-plays imitated by Herodas); (b) writing dates the fragment as A.D. s. ii, when the minor tragedians were no longer read. The play was *Ἀχιλλέως ἐραστάς*, not *Oeneus* (if there was such a play) or *Phoenix*. B. Bilinski, *De Graeciae in Pliniana descriptione (N.H. iv. 1-32) sinibus quaestiones*: (1) Pliny bounds the third *sinus* by Acrocerania instead of Malea on the west, not through confusion of Varro and Agrippa, but to treat Greece as a geographical unit. He follows Eratosthenes and Agrippa by thinking of the peninsula and not the gulf here, and uses *sinus* = 'projection of land'. (2) Pliny's sources for measurements of the separate gulfs of Greece, and his method of computation: Agrippa for the Ambraciot Gulf, Artemidorus for Corinthian Gulf measurements (but not description), and Isidore for gulfs of the Peloponnese. J. Wolski, *Arsaces II*: settles name of the Arsacid who was at war with Antiochus III in 210/9: Pompeius Trogus in Justin's extract (xli. 5), Strabo and Isidore of Charax represent the authentic tradition for the

first Arsacids (Wolski in *Eos* 38, 1937, and 39, 1938); and Justin's *Arsaces et ipse nomine* (xli. 5. 5-7) means that Arsaces was the proper name of this king, son and successor of Arsaces I. Sophia Abramowicz, *Quaestiuncula Hesiodica (de monstrorum stemmate in 'Theogonia'):* ἡ δὲ in 319 is Hydra, in 326 Chimaera, in 295 Ceto. Ludovica Rychlewska, *In Anonymum Hermogenis Statuum Interpretem* (Rh. Gr. vii. 397-442 Walz) cum Nilo (Pax. Gr. Suppl. 670 ff. 36 v-65 r) collatum observationes criticae: collation from 397 to 421. 13: attacks Walz.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES

XXV: 1947

F. M. Heichelheim and G. Schwarzenberger, *An Edict of Constantine the Great: a Contribution to the Study of Interpolations:* the edict exists both in inscriptions and as an excerpt in *Cod. Theod.* ix. 5. 1 and *Cod. Iust.* ix. 8. 3; from the comparison much can be inferred on the methods and legal powers of the compilers. G. Rudberg, *Wissen und Tugend:* the use of *δῶδος* and *μέθοδος* in Plato etc. may be connected with Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 286 ff., and other passages discussed by O. Becker (in *Das Bild des Weges*); and may have some bearing on the Socratic association of virtue and knowledge. E. Skard, *Vexillum Virtutis: vexillum*, a purely Roman object, is turned already to metaphorical use in Cicero; later, Christian writers evolved *v. pietatis, fidei, continentiae*, etc.; whence modern expressions like 'banner of freedom'. L. Amundsen, *Notes to the Preface of Livy:* Livy's preface imitates Sallust, while protesting against Sallust's anti-romantic view—in the *Historiae*—of ancient Rome. S. Eitrem, *A purificatory rite and some allied rites de passage:* assembles various conceptions—such as purification by divided victims—which may shed light on the *dies intercalaris* of the Roman Calendar. M. Richard, *Une ancienne collection d'homélies grecques sur les psaumes i-xv:* texts, of which an edition is promised, illustrating the theology of Arianism. E. Eggen, *Postquam calix babilonis:* on two versions of a hymn on St. Olav. E. Skard, *Eine Bemerkung über spätrömisches Strafrecht in einer Homilie des 'Sophisten' Asterios:* the Arian preacher (of Richard's article, *supra*) records the custom in the time of Constantine of punishing a soldier by the symbolic burning of his cloak.

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

VIII. 2: 1947

G. Zuntz, *Baitylos and Bethel:* argues in detail for the hypothesis that *baitylos* is 'Asiatic', pre-Greek, and pre-Semitic, meaning a small sacred stone personified in a deity of the same name; it became assimilated by false etymology with the Semitic for 'temple' (*bethel*). P. Maas, *Fragmen-*

tum epicum Hauniense: photograph and conjectural text of six lines first published in *Pap. Graec. Haun.* 1 (1942), p. 13. 4. J. Danstrup, *The State and Landed Property in Byzantium to c. 1250:* the history of the imperial domains, with related matters such as the emperors' unsuccessful championship of small farms against great, shows a decrease in imperial power corresponding to a decrease in property. A. Afzelius, *Lex Annalis:* rejecting Mommsen's theory of the *biennium*, A. discusses afresh the *ordo honorum* and the minimum age for seeking the various offices, as prescribed by the *Lex Villia* and as modified by Sulla. F. Blatt, *Classical Features in Medieval Latin:* on the use of different formulae of dating as indicating humanist or anti-humanist tendencies.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

LXXII. 1: 1946

P. Chantraine, *Sur l'emploi de κτήματα au sens de 'bétail, cheptel'*, gives examples, including one of the Doric κτήματα. N. I. Herescu, *Au dossier des decem menses* (Virgil, *Ecl.* iv. 61), shows from ancient authors that lunar months of 27.3 days are meant. E. des Places, *Le texte des 'Lois' de Platon;* the only sources are A, O, and corrections in K. H. Fournier, *Formules homériques de référence,* analyses the formulas used to introduce and end speeches, concluding that it is immaterial what verb of saying is used and what tense is given to it.

LXXII. 2.

J. Vendryes, *Italique 'fancua'*, discusses the etymology of *fancua* = *membra*. J. Carcopino, *Notes biographiques sur M. Valerius Messala,* follows his career from 42-37 B.C. Messala adhered to Antony, was seconded to Octavian's service for the war against Sex. Pompeius, then rejoined Antony, but broke with him in 33 and was thereafter employed by Octavian in posts of increasing responsibility. His campaign against the Illyrian Salassi (not those of the Val d'Aosta) belongs to 29 B.C. E. Laroche, *Les Noms grecs de l'astronomie* shows that, for those who make any distinction, ἀστρονομία is the study of the movements of the stars, ἀστρολογία that of their physical nature and supposed effects. T. W. Allen, *Aeneas Tacticus;* notes and emendations on 80 passages. T. W. Allen, *Theognis;* notes on 111, 185, 285 + 1282 (ῥόος = ἔρυξ), 347, 628, 939, 1143. H. van Effenterre, *Une bilangue éléocrétoise?* publishes a stone from Drosos that has two short inscriptions, one in Greek, the other in 'eteo-Cretan'. The Greek may be a translation, and may permit some conclusions on 'eteo-Cretan'. J. le Gall, *La date de la Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae et celle de la Lex Mamilia Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia,* places both laws in 47 B.C. Notes and discussions: G. Matthieu on Ollier's *Le mirage spartiate*, remarks on Lucian's freedom from the 'Spartan illusion'.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- American School of Classical Studies at Athens.* Ancient Corinth: a Guide to the Excavations. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. Pp. 127; 23 figs., 2 plans. Athens: American School, 1947. Paper, \$1.50.
- Anti (C.)* Teatri Greci Arcaici. Pp. 337; 8 plates, 81 figs. Padua: 'Le Tre Venezie', 1947. Paper, L. 3000.
- Armstrong (A. H.)* An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy. Pp. xvi+241. London: Methuen, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Baynes (N. H.)* The Thought-World of East Rome. Pp. 45. London: Oxford University Press, 1947. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Beazley (J. D.)* Etruscan Vase-Painting. (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology.) Pp. 351; 40 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. Cloth, £4 4s. net.
- Bluck (R. S.)* Plato's Seventh and Eighth Letters. Edited with introduction and notes. Pp. 188. Cambridge: University Press, 1947. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Brown (N. O.)* Hermes the Thief. The Evolution of a Myth. Pp. 164. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1947. Cloth, \$3.
- Burn (A. R.)* Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Empire. (Teach Yourself History Library.) Pp. xiii+297. London: English Universities Press, 1947. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Butts (H. R.)* The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. XI.) Pp. 247. Privately printed, 1947. (To be obtained from the author at 305 East Park Street, Vandalia, Missouri.) Paper, \$4.
- Cahn (H. A.)* Griechische Münzen archaischer Zeit. Pp. 32; plates. Basel: Amerbach, 1947. Paper, 3.80 Sw. fr.
- Delatte (A.)* Les Portulans Grecs. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. CVII.) Pp. xxiv+400. Paris: Droz, 1947. Paper, 6.75 fr.
- de Saint-Denis (E.)* Le Vocabulaire des Animaux Marins en Latin Classique. (Études et Commentaires, II.) Pp. 122. Paris: Klincksieck, 1947. Paper, 300 fr.
- Des Places (E.)* Le Pronom chez Pindare. Recherches philologiques et critiques. (Études et Commentaires, III.) Pp. 114. Paris: Klincksieck, 1947. Paper.
- Diercks (G. F.)* Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus De Oratione. Kritische Uitgave met Prolegomena, Vertaling en Philologisch-Exegetisch-Liturgische Commentaar. Pp. civ+312. Bussum: Brand, 1947. Paper, fl. 11.50.
- Dorjahn (A. P.)* Political Forgiveness in Old Athens: the Amnesty of 403 B.C. (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, No. 13.) Pp. 56. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University, 1946. Cloth, \$1.50.
- Erbse (H.)* Fragmente griechischer Theosophien. (Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft, Band 4.) Pp. vi+234. Hamburg: Hansischer Verlag, 1941. Paper.
- Ernout (A.)* Plaute: Comédies. Tome VII: Trinummus, Truculentus, Vidularia, fragmenta. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 205. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper, 200 fr.
- Excavations at Dura-Europos.* Final Report IV. Part III: The Lamps. By P. V. C. Baur. Pp. viii+84; 16 plates, 38 figs. in text. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth, \$4.
- Flacelière (R.)* Plutarque: Sur la Disparition des Oracles. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, 3^e série, fasc. 14.) Pp. 269. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper.
- Fleischer (U.)* Untersuchungen zu den pseudo-hippokratischen Schriften Παρὰ γὰρ ἑλίας, Περὶ ἰγρῶς und Περὶ εὐχρηστικῆς. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Band 240.) Pp. 112. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1939. Paper.
- Fowler (W. W.)* Rome. Second edition, revised by M. P. Charlesworth. (Home University Library.) Pp. 168. London: Oxford University Press, 1947. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Gerlo (A.)* Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus: De Pallio. Kritische Uitgave met Vertaling en Commentaar. Deel I: Inleiding, Tekst en Vertaling. Pp. x+103. Deel II: Commentaar. Pp. 225. Wetteren: De Meester, 1940. Paper.
- Gigon (O.)* Sokrates, sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte. Pp. 320. Bern: Francke, 1947. Cloth, 11.50 Sw. fr.
- Greene (Lord.)* Classics and the Social Revolution of Our Time. Pp. 32. London: Oxford University Press, 1947. Paper, 8d. net.
- Hamilton (E.)* The Great Age of Greek Literature. Pp. 347. London: Bell, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Henry (R.)* Ctésias: la Perse, l'Inde, les sommaires de Photius. (Collection Lebeque, No. 84.) Pp. 99; 1 plate, map. Brussels: Office de Publicité S.C., 1947. Paper, 25 fr.
- Jaeger (W.)* Aristotle: Fundamentals of his Development. Translated with the author's corrections and additions by R. Robinson. Second edition. Pp. 475. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 21s. net.
- Jaeger (W.)* The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers. Pp. vii+259. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Jones (C. W.)* Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England. Pp. xiii+232. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth.
- Jones (O. N.)* Faciliora Reddenda. Pp. 96. London: Blackie, 1947. Cloth, 2s.
- Koldř (A.)* De re metrica poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum. Pp. 385. Prague: Nakladatelství Melantrich, 1947. Paper, 200 Kčs.
- Lattimore (R.)* The Odes of Pindar translated. Pp. xii+170. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Legrand (P. E.)* Hérodote: Livre V. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper, 225 fr.

- Marouzeau* (J.) *Térence: Comédies. Tome II: Heautontimorumenos, Phormio.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 202. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper, 225 fr.
- Mathieu* (G.) *Démosthène: Plaidoyers Politiques. Tome IV: Sur la Couronne, contre Aristogiton.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 213. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper, 275 fr.
- Owen* (E. T.) *The Story of the Iliad.* Pp. xi+248. London: Bell, 1947. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Pohlens* (M.) *Der hellenische Mensch.* Pp. 477: 17 plates. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947. Paper.
- Rice* (D. T.) *The Byzantine Element in Late Saxon Art.* (W. H. Charlton Memorial Lecture, 1946.) Pp. 20. London: Oxford University Press, 1947. Paper, 3s. net.
- Rutenber* (C. G.) *The Doctrine of the Imitation of God in Plato.* Pp. 115. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Paper, 8s. 6d. net.
- Staiger* (E.) *Euripides: Ion.* Deutsch mit einer Einleitung. Pp. 66. Bern: Francke, 1947. Boards, 5.50 Sw. fr.
- Tilly* (B.) *Vergil's Latium.* Pp. 133; 21 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Van der Graaf* (C.) *The Dirae, with translation, commentary and an investigation of its authorship.* Pp. xviii+153. Leiden: Brill, 1945. Paper.
- Wagenvoort* (H.) *Roman Dynamism.* Pp. 214. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Weiss* (R.) *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy.* Pp. ii+24. London: H. K. Lewis & Co., 1947. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Williamson* (I.) *The Friday Afternoon Latin Book.* Pp. 79. London: Blackie, 1947. Cloth, 2s. 3d.
- Wolfson* (H. A.) *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam.* 2 vols. Pp. xvi+462; xiv+531. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth, 55s. net.
- Zürcher* (W.) *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides.* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 2.) Pp. xii+197. Basel: Reinhardt, 1947. Paper, 12.50 Sw. fr.

plates.

lation,
author-
1945.

. 214.

Italy.
1947.

Latin
Cloth,

religious
Islam.
bridge,
ondon:
ss. net,
nen im
eitträge
xii+
50 Sw.